

THE SOCIAL CREDITER

FOR POLITICAL AND ECONOMIC REALISM

Vol. 9. No. 7.

Registered at G.P.O. as a Newspaper
Postage (home and abroad) 1d.

SATURDAY, OCTOBER 24, 1942.

6d. Weekly.

FROM WEEK TO WEEK

Notice the renewed insistence on "that bad man" as the whole cause of the war. "The low whining note of fear" is heard from that wicked man, and his Generals are assuring the Germans that Hitler alone is responsible for the attack on Russia.

Sooner or later, Hitler will be ditched ("Hang the Kaiser"—) and those "gains" in every country which the Archbishop of Canterbury felt that it might take another war to bring about, can then be quietly consolidated. In fact, "only in war, or under threat of war, will the British Government, embark on large scale Planning." For British Government, read "any Government which does not yearn to take its orders from an international Junta."

The ways of dollar diplomacy do not vary noticeably. During the later nineteenth and early twentieth century, they were tried out and perfected in South and Central America. Failing to obtain fantastic commercial concessions by direct bribery, (when it did fail) the method was to use the money to foment a rising against the existing Government, not usually a difficult task, from the nature of the Governments.

South America is not what it was, from the Wall Street point of view, and India and the East afford an attractive prospect, but with certain serious drawbacks.

Obviously, the first step is to get the American public, which knows as much about India as it does about Sanskrit, to believe that the British have treated the natives of India as the Americans treated the "Indians" of America. At the present time, as many responsible Americans have themselves observed, the American public talks and behaves as though (odd thought) the United States were really fighting against, instead of with, Great Britain (pardon me, Britain.)

India does, however, present real difficulties to the policy. Oddly enough, for at least seventy years the idea that a superior Government Official of the Indian Government could be bribed was not a hopeful line to pursue. And secondly, those minority sections of the large number of the population of India, mostly in Southern India, who could be worked up to agitation against the Government, were both despised by the remainder, and not very useful in any form of action more violent than voting at a conference.

It is clear, however, that the role of Noble Deliverer of Oppressed People, (in return, of course, for certain small trade concessions) is already staked out for the Peace Conference.

In fact, it's in the Atlantic Charter, in case you missed it.

New York *Life*, which is frequently funniest uninten-

tionally, has been severely criticised for publishing an article in which appear *inter alia* the words "Americans are not fighting to keep the British Empire together."

For our part, the only thing about this we object to is the customary American profusion of words. Why not put a full stop after the word "fighting," and leave it at that?

No, Clarence, we do not know certainly that Professor Arnold Toynbee "Chatham House," is in charge of the Propaganda to Enemy-occupied Countries assuring them of the coming restoration of their Local Sovereignty. We are confident, however, that he has not been interned under Regulation 18B. This will take place when Mr. Montagu Norman is shot in the Long Gallery of the Tower for financing Hitler and concerting with that "oleaginous rascal," Dr. Schacht.

"The lex talionis was not an *exclusively* [our italics] Jewish conception. . . Whether anything is to be gained, either for safety or morality, by sparing Nazism the experience it so gloatingly inflicts on its victims is another matter."
— *The Jewish Chronicle*.

About Mr. Wendell Willkie's recent utterances on the subject of a second front a newspaper headline reported Lord Davies's opinion that 'Willkie Spoke for Millions.'

Whose millions?

Builders Reject Government Contract Form

"At a special general meeting of the National Federation of Building Trades Employers, held in London and attended by members from all parts of the country, it was unanimously decided to instruct members of the Federation not to accept the new standard form of Government contract, pending negotiations with the Government Departments concerned. The Federation of Civil Engineering Contractors has issued similar instructions.

"The following memorandum on the subject is issued jointly by the National Federation of Building Trades Employers and the Federation of Civil Engineering Contractors (our italics):—

"The Contracts Co-ordinating Committee of the Government Contracting Departments has introduced a new form of contract conditions for Government building and civil engineering works. The National Federation of Building Trades Employers and the Federation of Civil Engineering Contractors, though they fully accept the Government's view that a new single form is desirable, have represented to Ministers that the new form, on which the industrial organisations

have not been consulted, is based on principles they regard as very unfair.

“By way of example, it would deny all right of appeal to independent arbitration on fundamental matters, with the result that on these matters *the officials of the Government Departments would be left as judges in their own cause, with autocratic powers not only to administer, but also to interpret the contract, contrary to general industrial practice.*

“Another example is that, if the works or buildings develop faults or failures by reason of errors in the design, *the responsibility for the mistakes of the Government Departments’ designers is placed on the contractor.*

“So seriously do the Federations regard this new action by the Government Departments, that they have instructed their members to make it clear, when tendering for Government work, that their tenders are subject to adjustment of the terms of contract in a manner to be agreed with the Government Departments. In issuing this instruction, the Federations have made it quite clear that *on no account must there be any holding up of Government work at this time, and that in every case the actual work must be started immediately and carried out with the utmost possible expedition;* but they do maintain that the Government should give effect to the democratic principle of collective bargaining, and the right of the Federations to discuss and agree with the Government Departments the conditions of contract which their members are to be asked to sign.”

—*The Illustrated Carpenter and Builder*, October 9, 1942.

“NONCONFORMITY”

By N. F. W.

In reading this most unbelievably ingenuous volume* by Mr. Roth, who is lecturer on Jewish history at Cambridge, one or two points have forced themselves upon me, not at all bearing out the author’s thesis, but connected with what is called the Jewish Problem.

In theory, Nonconformity is the claim, very hard to gainsay, to worship God how, when and where one likes. That is Protestantism—an event in the course of what we call human history. It would seem to be axiomatic. But I feel that the validity of such a claim ultimately rests on our conception of the word God, and of the reality behind it; for no claim can be absolute in this world—that is, irrespective of circumstances or conditions.

Mr Roth’s thesis is that the Jew can become a very good Englishman, and that his absorption into the body politic is not only the solution of the Jewish Problem but makes positively for the common-weal. In explication, as it were, of this theory, he shows us what is, in effect, the capitulation of nineteenth century London to the Sassoons and Rothschilds and their kind, largely through their dominance of what is known as the “Marlborough House Set,” as one after another, the numerous Sassoon brothers deserted the East, where they had taken the lead in industrialising Northern India, and descended on Victorian London, equipped with boundless wealth and bonhomie, and a taste in food and cigars and wine exactly suited to the Heir of the Throne. This was the period when God-fearing Englishmen, following the expensive lead of their Hebrew Prime Minister and the Sassoons, furnished their strictly monogamous draw-

ing rooms to look like Turkish harems and Maharajahs’ palaces, and broke every canon of good 17th and 18th century English taste.

All this, if a trifle tawdry, makes fairly plain sailing for Mr. Roth’s theme. But it has another side, upon which, whether through ignorance or out of consideration for his argument, he does not touch. For it was at about this same time (1895, to be exact) that Theodore Herzl, founder and Chairman of the Zionist Movement that so convulses our present world, made his first visit to London. When, as he describes in his published “Diaries,” he discussed with Colonel Goldschmidt, like Disraeli a Christianised Jew, high in British military and social circles (the Goldschmidts were prominent in the City in the days of George I), ways and means of expropriating the British aristocracy, which it appeared to them, constituted a barrier to Jewish aims.

According to Herzl, Colonel Goldschmidt advised progressive taxation, and especially of land. This idea is similar to that elaborated in No. 6 of the Protocols of the Learned Elders of Zion, thus: “The aristocracy of the *goyim* as a political force is dead—we need not take it into account; but as landed proprietors they can still be harmful to us, in the fact that they are self-sufficient in the resources on which they live. It is essential to us at whatever cost to deprive them of their landed property—in loading land with debt.”

There does not seem to be much ambiguity about that, though Mr. Roth in his book dismisses the Protocols as the figment of a diseased mind, desirous of sowing discord. No doubt the landowner of 1895 would have done the same. But that was before Colonel Goldschmidt’s ingenious idea of land-expropriation had got under way and while income tax was sixpence in the pound. Only fourteen years later, in 1909, Death Duties, that most literal and deadly application of Colonel Goldschmidt’s suggestion, were introduced by the Nonconformist Welsh solicitor, David Lloyd George, as Liberal Chancellor of the Exchequer.

Was this pure coincidence? And was it again pure chance that, eight years later in 1915-16 through Scott of the *Manchester Guardian*, brought this same Minister as Chairman of the Munitions of War Committee in desperate search for home-produced acetone, in touch with Dr. Chaim Weizmann? Dr. Weizmann, as Mr. Lloyd George tells us in his *Memoirs*, was at that time unknown to the general public. But he had already, according to Max Nordau, been actively engaged for some time, in organising Zionism in this country with the approval and help of Sir Herbert Samuel and the Rothschilds and Lord Melchett, with whose firm, Brunner Mond and Company, he was associated as a chemist.

In due course acetone produced from cereals was forthcoming, to the great assistance of our war effort, and as a *quid pro quo*, Dr. Weizmann asked for, and received through the agency of Mr. Lloyd George, what is known as the Balfour Declaration, respecting the return of the Jews to Palestine. Weizmann, himself, was one of the drafters of its text, along with other members of the Zionist Committee, including Israel Sieff and Simon Marks, both of Marks and Spencer Limited.

Among many other results, this move constituted such a going-back on “the word of an Englishman” as regards our undertaking in return for Arab military assistance against the Turks as alienated the whole Moslem world. It must have done our prestige in the East more harm than, perhaps, any other single act. Incidentally it broke the heart of

**The Sassoon Dynasty* by CECIL ROTH.

Lawrence of Arabia, whom Mr. Roth dismisses briefly as "a suspiciously simple" mischief-maker. Thus it goes on: not at all as Mr. Roth would have us see it—a mere picture of lavish Edwardian entertainment and affable back-chat—but, as it appears to my, I hope, not too prejudiced eye, in drab and miserable intrigue.

In course of time came the Versailles Treaty negotiations, which brought together Mr. Lloyd George and Philip, almost the last of the Sassoons. Unhappy, restless, religionless, synthetic "Englishman," and millionaire baronet; with the dark complexion and almond eyes and lithe body of the East—his parents came of two of the most potent Hebrew strains in Europe, for his mother was a Paris Rothschild. The inevitable happened—it is strange how often it does!—and Philip Sassoon, the strength of whose Parliamentary associations with Lord Melchett and the Rothschilds had been one of the main inducements to the signing of the Palestine Declaration, became Parliamentary Private Secretary to the Nonconformist Welsh Premier, now probably the second most powerful politician in the world, "whose philo-emitism was such"—to quote Mr. Roth—"that to be a Jew was in itself a recommendation to him."

Later Sir Philip became Under Secretary for Air still under Mr. Lloyd George, now appointed official solicitor to the Zionist Movement. It was at the Sassoon house, built just at this time at Lympne in Kent, in close proximity to the Channel ports, that there was so much coming and going of post-war secret diplomacy connected with early reactions to the Treaty of Versailles.

What a stricken mess it all appears to be! Without statesmanship or order, or direction, except for the steady, remorseless increase everywhere, like a rising ocean tide, of debt and taxation, and of the continuous alienation of property—not merely of aristocratic acres, but real property of all kinds, away from individuals, and into the control of corporations.

The moral which Mr. Roth would have the reader draw from his book, ignoring as he does all the above, is to say the least of it, ingenious. Accept the Jews as blood brothers, he says, as fellow countrymen, and allow them the highest privileges of citizenship. Give them High Society for their play-ground, and Royalty for their play-mates, and the sons and daughters of your aristocracy for their bed-fellows, and they will reward you by becoming rapidly sterile and dying out. And he cites England as a case in point and the Sassoons as a proof of his contention.

But the matter is not really quite so simple—that is, for the Gentile host. To the British, at least, who are a tolerant race, as Mr. Roth frankly admits, the Jewish Problem has never been the mere presence of Jews as individuals in their midst. After all, the British themselves are equally, if not more, widely "dispersed" over the face of this globe, than the Jews; yet nowhere, I think, so as to constitute a "problem." For instance, the fact that for the last hundred years or so Scottish engineers must have controlled at least 90 per cent. of all ships' engine-rooms, has not resulted in any sort of crisis in maritime progress or discipline. The Merchant Marine has shown no tendency to steam sideways or stern first when its masters (English, or American, or German, or whatever) would have it keep its course. If there is a Jewish Problem, in the same sense that there is a Jewish, one has not heard of it.

But the plain truth of the Jewish "Dispersion" is that

as a direct result of it, *all* Gentile nations are presented with an acute problem of how to keep themselves and their institutions from becoming "judaised." That, in fact, is the Jewish Problem; but apparently the Jew is not born who can see it.

Mr. Roth's theory might work out correctly from his point of view, and the Sassoons and Rothschilds and Montefiores and Goldschmidts nominally disappear from our midst, and yet their political philosophy of mental servitude survive them, as it already threatens to do, firmly clamped down on Society in the shape of a huge Bureaucracy.

In plain English, as I said at the beginning of this, the Jew is the arch-nonconformist, the super-Protestant, who claims the right, which would appear to be elementary, to worship God in his own way. And especially does he claim this from the British race, who have always boasted of their mental tolerance. But unhappily for the inhabitants of this world, Jew as well as Gentile, the God of the Jew is no mere moral personification, confined to the temple and the Church, but, in fact, the policy of his "higher-ups," which is completely hidden from the majority, even of the Jews themselves, by the totalitarian secret-society-like organisation of the race.

It follows inevitably from this fact that what his claim to complete "religious freedom" amounts to in the case of the Jew is the pursuit of an alien racial policy, *within* the national policy of his host; one, that is, dictated from an external, extra-national source. This policy must be what we know as Internationalism. And it is completely obvious and inevitable that in a world of different (not at all necessarily differing) nationalities, unless and until the race making such a claim either controls the whole world or else is forced by some means to relinquish its claim, there is bound to be continuous, and no doubt *increasing* discord, antagonism and ultimately war, *everywhere and all the time.*

NOW READY:—

"The Tragedy of Human Effort"

By C. H. DOUGLAS

Major Douglas's Liverpool Address, *The Tragedy of Human Effort*, first printed in 1937.

The Address is strikingly apposite to the immediate situation, and has for that reason been reprinted.

ALSO

"The Policy of a Philosophy"

The first republication in pamphlet form of the address given to a conference of social crediters in June, 1937.

Price: 7d. Each.

from all booksellers, or from the publishers (postage 1d.)

From K. R. P. PUBLICATIONS LIMITED,
49, PRINCE ALFRED ROAD, LIVERPOOL. 15.

THE SOCIAL CREDITER

This journal expresses and supports the policy of the Social Credit Secretariat, which 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 30/-; Six months 15/-; Three months 7s. 6d.

Offices: (Editorial and Business) 49, PRINCE ALFRED ROAD, LIVERPOOL, 15, Telephone: Wavertree 435.

Vol. 9 No. 7.

Saturday, October 24, 1942.

Parliament and Social Credit

The following passage is taken from column 1586 of the Official Report of House of Commons Debates (Hansard) for October 13, when the question of the Bank of International Settlements was raised on the Adjournment:—

Mr. Hely-Hutchinson: "... The second point is the question of whether the Bank for International Settlements is likely to be a useful instrument in post-war times. Certainly, even with the most uninformed minds, one would think it is likely to be, but it is rather a technical matter, and I should think that the Chancellor of the Exchequer would, naturally, be guided by expert opinion thereon. I should imagine he would naturally consult the Governor of the Bank of England, and possibly people in the Treasury like Lord Keynes and Lord Catto, who really do know something about this subject. I hear some signs of dissent, and I have no doubt, for instance, that the hon. Member for Lowestoft (Mr. Loftus) would desire the Chancellor to consult his Grace the Duke of Bedford and Major Douglas.

NOTE: Quite apart from Mr. Hely-Hutchinson's confusion of national *policy*, which is not at present the subject of expert ascertainment let alone expression, with banking *technique*, concerning which judgment of Mr. Montagu Norman's expertness can only be assessed with full knowledge of the policy he has been trying to pursue, it is clearly his intention to associate the Duke of Bedford with Major Douglas. Economics is by no means a subject of restricted scope, and it is quite possible that Mr. Hely-Hutchinson knows some of the facts of economics, and may even understand their meaning. The same might be said of almost anybody, for example the Duke of Bedford. But knowledge of some of the facts of economics, even when accompanied by a correct apprehension of their meaning does not constitute an understanding of Social Credit, and there is nothing that we know in the published statements of the Duke of Bedford that would justify attachment of the label Social Crediter to him. Upon other matters the Duke of Bedford is known to hold highly unpopular opinions and Major Douglas highly popular opinions, which find increasing expression even in the House of Commons.

Mr. Loftus: Can the hon. Member quote any speech or any statement I have ever made in my life advocating the policy of Social Credit? I challenge him to do so. I challenge him also to withdraw his statement if he is not able to give the quotation.

NOTE: Mr. Loftus's candour might suitably set an ex-

ample both inside and outside the House of Commons. That Mr. Loftus has never advocated the *policy* of Social Credit may open the minds of 'friends' we could do better without to the now acknowledged and highly dangerous possibility of making monetary reform the tool of totalitarianism in one of its forms—New Deal, National-Socialist, International-Socialist, or some other to which no permanent label has yet been affixed, already prepared, and possibly well-known to the denizens of the political underworld.

Mr. Hely-Hutchinson: I have in mind a number of cases where the hon. Member has advocated the doctrines which are set forth by a body called the Economic Reform Club, which I think is largely associated in most people's minds with the principle of Social Credit.

NOTE: The association is, in all significant respects, a false association. On this point nothing is more conclusive than the studious disregard in every quarter even remotely connected with the argumentative body named to the plain indication of Douglas: "I am satisfied that further argument upon technical matters will achieve little or nothing, and certainly not in the time available, and that the only hope of civilisation lies in forcing a new policy upon those who have control of the national activities, of whom the bankers and financiers are by far the most important. We do not want Parliament to pass laws resembling treatises on economics. What we want is for Parliament to pass a minimum of laws designed to penalise the heads of any great industry, and banking and finance in particular, if they do not produce the results desired."

Mr. Loftus: The Economic Reform Club advocates no specific remedy of any kind, and its lists of vice-presidents and supporters include all classes of economists. I again ask the hon. Member to substantiate his charge or to do the usual thing and withdraw it.

Mr. Hely-Hutchinson: I think that matter will have to settle itself by reference to the Official Report. . . .

Later in the debate Mr. Loftus said:—

The hon. Member accused me of being an advocate of the solution known as the Douglas Social Credit system. In my first speech in the House I made it clear that I did not advocate that solution, and since then I have made that clear in speech after speech. Then I challenged the hon. Member to withdraw or substantiate his charge. He attempted to do so. How? He said I was vice-president of the Economic Reform Club, which advocated the Douglas Social Credit system. I share the vice-presidency of the Economic Reform Club with distinguished Members of the Upper House—Lord Northbourne, Lord Sempill—and also with Lady Snowden, and others. The constitution of that Club specifically lays down that it does not advocate any particular solution. . . .

Correction

The word 'promise,' line 2 col. 1 p. 6 in *The Social Crediter*, October 17 should have been 'premise,' and 'binds,' line 17 col. 2 of the same page, should have been 'divides.' We regret these errors in Mrs Best's article last week.—Ed.

$$1 + 1 = 1$$

By W. WILSON

One of the most valuable qualities resulting from thinking in terms of reality is the capacity to differentiate between what is interesting and what is useful. I have read a fair quantity of interesting literature about what are called the 'higher' dimensions of space and thought, but I have come to the conclusion that, for those who genuinely desire to help humanity through its present troubles, such speculations are valueless. Even in the more complex branches of research (and psychology is certainly one of them) it is necessary for the realist to make sure that he is firmly rooted before he begins soaring upward. And, since I shall be making some very unusual mental flights before this piece of writing is finished, I will first try to make my ground unmistakably clear.

First let it be understood that I intend to use the word *dimension* only in the strict geometric sense, the first, second and third dimensions being signified by the straight line, the plane and the solid figure respectively. As *time* is a constant, I do not think any useful purpose is served by calling it a dimension. When I refer to *dimensions of consciousness*, I shall mean the ability to comprehend spontaneously the respective geometric dimensions.

If we 'size up' human consciousness within this rigid, static, framework, it will, I think, have to be admitted that the general level of consciousness as it exists to-day falls considerably below the third dimension; that the highest minds hardly reach the third dimension, while the lowest minds do not fall below the second dimension. In short, the *whole* of human consciousness comes into the 'octave' which extends from the second to the third dimension. If we now add time to our framework and project our thoughts backward through history, we are brought to a similar conclusion, namely, that so far as it is possible to judge from existing records, human consciousness has always been two-to-three dimensional.

So much for consciousness, which denotes the *quality* of thoughts generated. *The way in which thought is generated* is quite another matter. It concerns mechanism, and brings us into a field of research which, if not new, is as undeveloped as were the physics of pre-Newtonian times.

Now, so far as thought-mechanism is concerned, it is necessary to start with a postulate. It is this: while consciousness is a fluctuating factor, one that can be seen to vary in every mind as well as between individuals, societies, races and periods of development—the mechanism by which people think is constant, *and it is a two-dimensional technique*.

Consider the evidence. Our most highly developed sense is that of sight. Sight is certainly more than two-dimensional, but it is far further from the truly three-dimensional than is generally assumed. Stereoscopic vision enables us to judge distance accurately within a strictly limited orbit. It also gives us a sense of solidity, but it does not provide us with three-dimensional truth about solid forms: to do this it is necessary to see an object from two or more viewpoints which are much more widely separated than are our two eyes. (Remember that I am still speaking within the rigid framework which I first laid down, which excludes both time and memory.)

The sense of touch is three-dimensional only in respect

of quite small objects which are within reach. You can fold your hand around a billiard ball and get a three-dimensional impression of it. But many near objects are bigger than billiard balls, and most of the world is out of reach. Hearing is less than two-dimensional. Taste and smell are unashamedly one-dimensional.

Before we can conceive the truth about the form alone of a simple solid, we have to piece together two or more sensual impressions and, as it were, weld them together with memory. Quite an elaborate process.

That this is so is reflected in the words we use. Most words can be paired up as complements. They are flat, one-sided things. In the process of living we get to know that a *front* cannot exist without a *back*; that whenever an object moves, it is both *coming* and *going*; that each one of us is a *me* as well as a *you*. But the words, taken singly, cannot help us in forming such concepts. Like our sense impressions, they need to be digested in twos. If this is true of such simple words as I have quoted, how much hope have we of arriving at truth in words when dealing with subjects which are themselves abstract?

We are inclined to forget that words are only symbols. It is, I think, becoming increasingly important that, in writing, we should constantly bear this fact in mind, and should try, as far as possible, to recognise which words lead to two-dimensional impressions and which to three. *Truth* is a case in point. We have plenty of words to define accuracy. *Right* and *correct* are clearly two-dimensional. *Reality* is all-dimensional. So I suggest that *truth* belongs properly to three-dimensionality. The fact that this use of *truth* puts it in true with all the rest that I have to say, makes me wonder whether the word *truth* itself has not been debased.

The way in which we arrive at truth about anything is to take two or more two-dimensional impressions (flat sections) and put them together into one total concept (solid object). This principle applies whether the impressions reach us directly through the senses, or through words, or from within our minds as 'pure' thought. It can be formulated as $1 + 1 = 1$: Any six-year-old will tell you that this sum is not right, but any painter who has ever mixed colours, or woodworker who has ever made a dove-tailed joint, knows that it is true.

In the world of research this formula is brought constantly into play. Simply expressed, it amounts to taking things to pieces, scrutinising the parts and putting them together again. Intelligent boys do this with their toys, and it is interesting to observe that those of superior mentality also have the urge to put the parts together in different and better ways. The scientific method is only a development of the same principle: analytical research followed by synthesis. Thus we see that the formula $1 + 1 = 1$ expresses not only the way of truth, but also the way of creation.

is only another way of saying that Judaism is a two-dimen-

Douglas has likened Judaism to a one way street. That is a one dimensional religion. Christ presented mankind with the concept that, before you can know the truth about God, it is necessary to divide Him in half, and through the revelation which comes of a proper understanding of the duality, to arrive at a perfected concept of wholeness. Now, since the formula for truth is identical with the symbol of the Trinity, it follows that Christianity is the way from two-dimensional

righteousness to three-dimensional truth.

Now we all know to how great an extent the application of this trinitarian principle has expanded human consciousness. With our two-dimensional mechanism we have 'filled out' an enormous number of the 'cells' which will ultimately be joined to make total truth. But the one outstanding field to which the principle has not been applied is that of thought itself. Suppose we find that, once we have applied the formula to thought-mechanism, that we arrive at *spontaneous* three-dimensional thought! "You shall know the truth, and the truth will make you free."

This, I think, establishes my field of research.

(2)

Two-dimensional consciousness can be symbolised by parallel lines which never meet. Psychologically (see *Initiative—and all that*) this means that conscious and sub-conscious mental processes are kept in thought-tight compartments.

The development of conscious thought, operating alone, is seen in logic, legalism and abstract figures; that of sub-conscious thought in moral 'laws' built from instinctive and intuitive impulses. The severance to-day of these two essential parts of mental activity is too obvious to need stressing.

The conscious mind has a very natural objection to symbolism. On the other hand, the sub-conscious mind is incapable of reasoning, and therefore has to express itself in symbols. I emphasise this because some readers are inclined to object to symbolism as such. Since, in this section, I am forced to turn the attention to symbols in order to reach my conclusions, I can only hope that any objectors will give me credit for making my symbols clear.

What I know about Judaic symbolism leads me to believe that Judaism is an arrested manifestation of what was at one time a superior mental consciousness. In pre-Christian times the general consciousness must have been much nearer to the flatly two-dimensional than it is to-day. Nevertheless, both their symbols and their actions give evidence that the Jewish elders were even then reaching out towards the three-dimensional thought technique which is promised in Christianity but has still to be attained.

I have already described the truth trinity. In its briefest verbal form it amounts to Divide-Reveal-Re-unite. Now I think it is necessary to recognise the importance of the first factor: From early Biblical times the Jews have been adepts at dividing; but past that they got bogged, for the next word to the Jew is Conceal. Division with secrecy leads to division for division's sake, and this in turn leads to forceful control of division. Hence, divide and rule.

There could be no better symbol of division into eternity than Jacob's ladder. But, in masonic symbolism, there appears an important development. I commend to anybody who is sufficiently interested, the lecture on the first tracing board, a lecture usually given to masonic initiates. Man's life is here described as a circle standing upright between two parallel columns, the one called Moses, the other Solomon. On top of the circle, and linking the columns, is the open Bible (by implication the old Testament). Mounting from the Holy Book to heaven is Jacob's ladder. The rungs of the ladder are given moral attributes,

the first three rungs being Faith, Hope and Charity.

When we remember that masonry is supposed to date back to the building of Solomon's temple, we see that the two parallel columns are made to represent one live man (Solomon) and one dead man (Moses). Live wisdom, dead wisdom—the conscious and sub-conscious principles of mind. These are bridged by Faith (the Holy Book). At this stage the symbol begins to mean something in reality, but, after this promising start, the words of the lecturer rather spoil it: "and were men as conversant with the doctrines of that Holy Book and as adherent thereto as those two grand parallels were, it would bring us to Him who will not deceive us."

The implication here would appear to be that faith should not be applied to combine the two grand parallels, but to keep them grandly parallel. So much for the inner man. Now let us consider the ladder, which applies apparently to his conduct, projecting the same two grand parallels into the future.

The first fact to notice is that moral attributes are concepts belonging entirely to the one upright (the sub-conscious). They cannot therefore serve as connecting rungs for they do not reach the conscious parallel. Faith does, nevertheless, make a rung for it is more than a moral attribute. It has a three-dimensional quality in that it combines Hope (sub-conscious) and Certainty (conscious) "Faith is the substance of things hoped for."

Hope, as we have seen, is combined in faith, so this 'rung' can be eliminated. Charity (giving without taking) is another half-word which does not reach across.

So, after eliminating all superfluous factors, we arrive at the simplified symbol of two vertical parallels reaching down from the sky and connected before they arrive to earth by Faith. Now this comes so near to being an accurate symbol of the three-dimensional thought mechanism which I tried to describe in *Initiative—and all that*, that it takes the breath away. The difference is only directional. Old Testament faith turns the eye outward and upward to God, so that heaven at the top of the ladder is the most important factor. Christian faith turns the eye inward and downward to earth, by way of one's own inner ego. So, for the Christian symbol, what do we get? Instead of the uprights extending upward to an infinitely remote heaven, they are cut short as 'aerials'; the lower ends are firmly earthed. Faith connects the two and is answered by a return spark which is dynamic power. Two uprights—two horizontals: the cross.

From the initiation ceremony of masonry, it would be possible to produce a score of symbols which, subjected to a similar analysis, would lead to the same conclusion, namely, that the pre-Christian elders had all but arrived at the Christian dynamic. The one great stumbling block was secrecy, and this has proved so great a deterrent that now, nearly 2,000 years later, they are exactly where they were. Meanwhile, the universal consciousness has advanced slowly, but quite definitely until to-day we have arrived at what, to me, seems a significant psychological condition. Most individuals are now at a stage of *conscious* development approximating to the *sub-conscious* attainment which is 'frozen' in Judaism. Can it be that this gradual 'balancing up' process has a biological significance?

(3)

Suppose that we discover that the Jews *are* a chosen race, but that their biological mission is not quite what they

imagine it to be. Suppose we find that their task has been to hold back the next great evolutionary change until the whole of society is ready for it. Such a suggestion may seem fantastic, and not at all useful. That depends, firstly upon whether or not it is true and, secondly, if it is true, upon whether it bears upon the 'cutting edge' of current events. Now, assuming the acceptance of my theme up to this stage, what can we deduce from it?

It is a simple geometric fact that you cannot arrive at three-dimensional accuracy (truth) unless all your two-dimensional measurements are themselves accurate (righteousness). To stress this point I will say it in one or two other ways. It is no use trying to wire up an electric circuit with uninsulated wire. Psychologically: you cannot control the use of the two major principles of your mind *together*, unless you can use them properly separately. In religious terms: Christianity contains Judaism.

We have seen that division is the first factor in the Christian thought circuit. To the Jew, division would seem to be the very reason for existence; he is, by his very nature a divider. He cannot help it. The pitiful attempts at unity, unity and ever more unity, and the way in which every such attempt leads only to a more complete disintegration ought to be enough to convince anybody where it is that Jewish genius ends. Like the mills of God Judaism is grinding society so fine that we are arriving at a stage where every individual is not only at loggerheads with his neighbour, but is actually at loggerheads with himself. That is one aspect of the situation.

The other aspect concerns morals. Let us bear in mind that the sub-conscious mind is as active as the conscious mind, whether the conscious self admits of its existence or not. Righteous living amounts to the maintenance of harmony between the two, whilst keeping them separate. If our conscious decisions offend the sub-conscious instincts, or if our sub-conscious selves motivate actions which offend the reason, then there are evil consequences. So, too, we are likely to get into trouble if we allow our animal selves to seep through and get mixed up with our 'better' selves. All these facts have to be admitted and the conditions eliminated if we are to use our minds consciously as power circuits. Judaic moralistic propaganda operates to make people keep their minds in divided control.

The process has now advanced so far that it is possible to place people into broad categories according to degrees of disintegration (or, perhaps more accurately, *non-integration*). Both Jew and orthodox Christian err in that they turn their eyes outward instead of inward to God. The orthodox Christian is a step ahead of the Jew insofar as he believes in revelation rather than concealment. The intellectual agnostic has not learned how to measure his logical findings in relation to biological wellbeing. The moralist is divorced from reality. All these conditions of part-mindedness have arisen from conscious Judaic action, aided and abetted by the universal sub-conscious mind.

Now, if I am right in my belief that, with a proper understanding of the Christian thought mechanism, any reasonably well-meaning person will find that it is possible to fuse his two mental halves, so that any maladjustment that may exist is corrected, then we shall find that the action of Judaic reagents will have done more to prepare a condition favourable to grand fusion than anything that might have come by unimpeded development.

When can it be said that the time is ripe for the grand

fusion? I should say when it begins to enter human consciousness as a *reality*. To me it is quite real, so I should say that the time is ripe *now*.

Let there be no misapprehension about the nature of the grand fusion. It will raise the human thought mechanism by a complete dimensional octave. Very rapidly, social consciousness will become truly three-dimensional. What we have not yet comprehended will be 'added unto us.' We shall know the truth, and so be freed for ever from that laborious formula, $1 + 1 = 1$.

(4)

What I have written is either true or it isn't true. Since it concerns power, it can be tested to see whether it works. But, since mental power is biological, not mechanical, results, if and when they come, are more likely to be in the nature of *growth* than of the turning of wheels. It is a matter of sowing seeds in our own minds and watching to see whether anything sprouts.

The seed is Desire. The soil is the inner mind. The method of planting is simply to put in the seed with enough Faith. That is all.

But like all gardening a certain amount of care is needed. The soil must be reasonably good. This means that your reasoning self and your emotional self should be on good terms with each other. The seed should be good. This means that the desire, or objective, should be physically possible and *big enough to matter*. (I set myself going—or growing—by asking for the social dynamic. Well, here it is). The planting should be right. This means ask for results and do not try to tell your inner mind *how*. (Humility).

Finally, the faith must be of good quality. This means that it is necessary to believe that, in addition to your conscious 'I' there also exists another, sleeping, 'I' within you. Believe this, and go on believing it, and sooner or later your sleeping 'I' will wake up and respond. Have patience. (It took me three months to get the first positive results, and nine months before I got my first full answer.)

Points from Parliament

HOUSE OF COMMONS: OCTOBER 13

Bank for International Settlements

Mr. Stokes asked the Chancellor of the Exchequer the amount of deposits held by the Treasury with the Bank for International Settlements, either directly or through the Bank of England; how much of it is invested in Germany; and whether, since the outbreak of war, any principal or interest payment has been received from Germany on those deposits by the Bank for International Settlements on behalf of His Majesty's Government?

Sir K. Wood: The Hague Conference of 1930 provided for the ten creditor Governments concerned to make long-term deposits with the Bank for International Settlements. The British share in these deposits amounts to 26,500,000 Reichsmarks. These deposits, under the terms of the Hague agreements, bear no interest. The investments of the Bank in Germany are part of its general assets, and bear no direct relation to these deposits, and I understand that interest is being duly paid on these investments to the Bank.

Mr. Stokes asked the Chancellor of the Exchequer the number of shares held by each Axis state and by countries

under Axis control in the Bank of International Settlements?

Sir K. Wood: As I informed my hon. Friend the Member for Stoke (Mr Ellis Smith) on 6 October, this information is not available, but I will circulate in the OFFICIAL REPORT the numbers of shares originally subscribed in each country in which they were issued, in respect of which the Central Banks concerned or other financial institutions are entitled to exercise votes at General Meetings of the B.I.S.

Mr Stokes: As the answer is not clear, will the Chancellor also indicate who has the voting power—how it is distributed among the shareholders?

Sir K Wood: Perhaps the hon. Member will look at my reply.

Following are the figures referred to:

| | | | | | |
|--------------------------|--------|--------|----------------|-----|-------|
| United Kingdom | ... | 19,772 | Bulgaria | ... | 4,000 |
| Belgium | ... | 19,772 | Denmark | ... | 4,000 |
| France | ... | 19,772 | Roumania | ... | 4,000 |
| Italy | ... | 19,772 | Poland | ... | 4,000 |
| Germany | ... | 23,772 | Hungary | ... | 4,000 |
| Japan | ... | 19,770 | Czechoslovakia | ... | 4,000 |
| United States of America | 19,770 | | Norway | ... | 4,000 |
| Netherlands | ... | 4,000 | Yugoslavia | ... | 4,000 |
| Switzerland | ... | 4,000 | Latvia | ... | 500 |
| Sweden | ... | 4,000 | Lithuania | ... | 500 |
| Danzig | ... | 4,000 | Albania | ... | 500 |
| Finland | ... | 4,000 | Estonia | ... | 100 |
| Greece | ... | 4,000 | | | |

ADJOURNMENT: BANK FOR INTERNATIONAL SETTLEMENTS

Mr G. Strauss (Lambeth, North): ... I suggest that it is an obligation on the House to-day to consider very carefully the recent activities of the Bank for International Settlements, and to consider whether in present circumstances we are wise to remain associated with that organisation.

The history of the annual report recently issued by the Bank is rather peculiar. Apparently this report, a very long document running into over 200 pages, was first presented to a general meeting of shareholders—I do not know of whom they consisted—on June 8 of this year, by the President of the Bank, an American named Mr. McKittrick. On September 4, there was a Press conference in Basle, where the Bank was situated, and the contents of the report were given to the Press. On September 5, the German Press reported some extracts from this report, obviously with great glee, because the extracts presumably confirmed many of the desires of the German Government. Anyhow, we can be certain that the Press would not have given such prominence to this report, and to the Bank for International Settlements, unless it had been favourable in German eyes.

On September 17 some of the German papers arrived in this country, and the reports appearing in those papers were copied by some of the financial journals here. Considerable public interest was aroused, but it was not until October 1 that the matter was raised here in Parliament. We were then assured by the Chancellor of the Exchequer that nobody in this country was in possession of this report and that neither the Treasury nor the Bank of England knew anything about it. Afterwards, the Chancellor of the Exchequer was good enough to say that there had been a mistake and that actually the Ministry of Economic Warfare had a copy. Up to that time, October 1, the Bank of England, which is closely associated with the Bank for International Settlements, had apparently no knowledge of this very important report, and, as far as we know, had taken no steps to

obtain a copy. The House will be aware that on the directorate of the Bank for International Settlements sit Mr. Montagu Norman and Sir Otto Niemeyer, although these gentlemen, we are told, have not recently taken any part in the activities of the Bank...

The second thing is even more serious. The report lays down principles for a post-war economic system. The House will agree that it is very dangerous for a body with which we are nominally associated—and, in the eyes of the world, rather closely associated—to issue a report laying down post-war schemes of reconstruction. The Bank for International Settlements is known throughout the world for, not only very close Nazi associations, but Nazi domination. We have our directors still on the board, and that bank produces in its annual report proposals for setting up the economic basis of a new Europe after the war. That, I think, is very serious. It suggests to the German people that there is some form of collaboration between the Nazis and the Allies whom they are supposed to be fighting. It may give them hope of a peace arrangement between some elements in this country and in Germany...

B. I. S. and Taxation

Section 5. Finance Act, 1930:—

The Bank for International Settlements shall not be liable to any taxation, present or future, in respect either of the capital amount of, or of any income arising from, any part of the funds or investments of the Bank which result from payments made by the Government of the German Reich under the agreement entered into at the Hague on the 20th day of January, 1930, between the Government of the German Reich and certain other Governments, including the Government of the United Kingdom.

BOOKS TO READ

By C. H. Douglas:—

| | |
|-----------------------------|---------------------------|
| Economic Democracy |(edition exhausted) |
| Social Credit | 3/6 |
| The Monopoly of Credit |3/6 |
| Credit Power and Democracy | (edition exhausted) |
| Warning Democracy |(edition exhausted) |
| The Big Idea |2/6 |
| The Tragedy of Human Effort |7d. |
| The Policy of a Philosophy |7d. |
| The Use of Money |6d. |
| "This 'American' Business" |3d. |
| Social Credit Principles |1½d. |

ALSO

| | |
|--|----------|
| The Bankers of London by Percy Arnold |4/6 |
| Hitler's Policy is a Jewish Policy by Borge Jensen and P. R. Masson |6d. |
| Democratic Victory or the Slave State? by L. D. Byrne |4d. |
| How Alberta is Fighting Finance |2d. |
| The Rulers of Russia by Rev Denis Fahey |1/- |

Leaflets

| | |
|--|------------------------------|
| The Attack on Local Government by John Mitchell |9d. doz.; 50 for 2/6 |
| Taxation is Robbery |50 for 1/9; 100 for 3/- |
| (Please allow for postage when remitting). | |

From K.R.P. PUBLICATIONS LIMITED
49, PRINCE ALFRED ROAD, LIVERPOOL, 15.

Published by the proprietors K.R.P. Publications, Ltd., 49 Prince Alfred Road, Liverpool, 15. Printed by J. Hayes & Co., Woolton, Liverpool.