



THE MOVING STORM

BRYAN W. MONAHAN

The Moving Storm

*Contemporaneous commentaries on linked events of 1964-1968,
with an Introduction on historical significance*

By

BRYAN W. MONAHAN

The Twentieth Century A.D. has witnessed a transformation of the world more profound and extensive than in any period in the existence of the globe. In its beginning it seemed to promise such a flowering of Christian Graeco-Roman civilisation as had never appeared possible, for now the Curse of Adam would be borne by the magnificent complex of machines, setting free the Spirit in Man.

Instead, the Twentieth Century has seen the death, despoliation, and torture of hundreds of millions of men, women and children. The destruction of mankind has become a technical possibility, whose threat is employed to impose a universal slavery. The beneficial use of the miracle of modern technology has been centralised in the hands of would-be World Rulers, seeking to perpetuate a dynasty over a permanently enslaved mankind.

This book comments on the progress of this fatal conspiracy in recent years, displaying the pattern which underlies apparently disconnected events.

1969

TIDAL PUBLICATIONS BOX 3266, G.P.O.
SYDNEY 2001

K.R.P. PUBLICATIONS LTD.
245 CANN HALL ROAD LEYTONSTONE, LONDON, E.11

Registered at the General Post Office, Sydney for transmission through the post as a book.

THE MOVING STORM

Introduction

I

The moving of the hour hand of a wristlet watch is invisible to the unaided eye. Yet we can perceive that it moves by observing that after a lapse of time, it *has moved* from one position to another. What is it—“the moving finger writes and having writ, moves on”—that moves in history whose movement is marked by the succession of events? History tells of whole chains of events connected with a nation, person, thing, etc. Does this tell of movement? — What moves in music whose movement we *hear* in the flow of a melody? In music we have a succession of tones; but not every succession of tones constitutes a melody.

In melody we perceive a musical *meaning*, given in the relation of one tone to others. And just so in history we perceive a meaning when the events in a series have a significant relationship. What in music is melody, in history is *policy*. The late C. H. Douglas described history as crystallised policy; and policy, like melody, has its expression in time. *Written* history, however, is something else: as Douglas expressed it: “It is five percent fact, and ninety-five percent historian, even at its best. What value it possesses, and that may be considerable, depends primarily on the historian, and secondarily, on the equipment of the reader—on his ability to see the related facts in their true perspective.” The historian does not make history; yet history is made. Living history is the operation of policy.

II

“Policy” is a much used word, but what does it mean? It cannot be defined, just as “melody” cannot be defined. If there is a melody in a succession of tones, we *hear* it, without being able to say why. Perfectly analogously, we can recognise in certain successions of events a core of intent which gives them meaning, and creates *living* history—living as the music of an orchestra lives. It is this we perceive as policy, and it is a Beyond to the succession of events, not given by the events, but contained in their succession. That is why the value of written history to the reader depends on the equipment of the reader, just as the appreciation of music depends on the equipment of the hearer. Both require a cultivated faculty of perception.

We experience history, from day to day, from week to week, from year to year. But as individuals we participate in history for the most part only to a very limited extent; history comes to us as episodes in the form of items of news. This gives rise to what Douglas called the “episodic” view of history, it is as if the tones of a melody were played so far apart in time that their melodic meaning was completely obscured. But the melody, no longer audible, would still be there, for it is the melody which orders the succession of tones. So, in history, the pattern of events may not be visible; but if, in fact, the events, temporally distant, are none the less related, their ordering is the outcome of policy.

Now if, between the tones of a temporally extended melody, other tones were to be inserted, the melody which ordered the original tones might become impossible to find except by a skilled musician. And here, perhaps, a further analogy helps. A crime is a history arising out of a core of intent. But the criminal obscures the history by inserting false indications, making a murder, for example, appear to be an accident, or a loss due to robbery one due to fire, or arson the result of an electrical fault. So we have the criminologist to put the related facts in their true perspective.

(Music is more than an analogue of history, for one thing is expressed in both. But *as* analogy, music does not serve those few who do not *hear* music, and then another analogy must serve. Thus a series of letters may be a word, or nonsense: “language” as distinct from “ulgagane”. Episodically: l a n g u a g e; and *lastaxcommugpenquialgave*.

And what of this? MNEMONIC = Method Neatly Enabling Memory Of New Information Collected.

Again: What is a novel without its plot?)

In history writ large—the history of a people, of a nation, world history—the time-spaces between

significant events are almost always filled by random events. Further, chains of significant events occur simultaneously with other chains of significant events, like different melodies being played simultaneously. This again contributes to the episodic appearance of history as experienced. Thus to identify policy in history, one must recognise individual events as links in a particular chain—a chain beginning somewhere in the past and extending into the future. But when we recognise the chain, we perceive also the core of intent.

III

Life, no doubt, is full of the accidental; but it is full as well of the consequences of policies—policies which may be unrelated, related (inter linked) or opposed, and short in duration or long-term. A short-term policy may be defined as one which exists within the span of a generation, and a long-term policy one which transcends the generations. Long-term policies are those of *organisations*; and the most fundamental of such policies is survival of the organisation as such, be it a people, a nation, or an institution. Another such policy is the extension of the influence of the organisation, whether by example, precept, or power. Conversely, the existence of long-term policies denotes the existence of organisations which sustain them.

Two of the great policies active in history are religion, and power; and these are sometimes in association, and sometimes opposed—militant religion, or religion in restraint of power. But perhaps the most easily discernible policy is national power. There is, however, another policy, much less discernible, which stands opposed to national power: international power. It is known by its manifestation, but the organisation which sustains it is much less easily discovered than in the case of a nation.

Douglas wrote in 1946: “Perhaps the fairest material prospect ever opened to human vision, the Promised Land of Plenty and Leisure, appeared, towards the close of the nineteenth century, to be at hand. The Diamond Jubilee of Queen Victoria marked the perihelion of a British Empire superficially invincible, widely, if not universally, respected and far more united than any other organisation of comparable size, either before or after the disintegration of Mediaeval Europe; and a Continent of Europe which, if it betrayed disquieting signs to the trained observer, yet remained the unquestioned and unquestionable centre of civilisation and culture. Fifty years later, Europe lies in ruins; its grace and culture rent and torn, the helpless prey of conflicting ideologies and half-crazed fanatics; it and the British Empire, attacked from every quarter and disrupted by internal intrigues, would appear to be mere children of the storm of war, whose only hope of survival is a refuge under the shadow of a World Government.”

This transformation from a World of Promise to a World at War (which still endures) is the manifestation of a policy which stands opposed to nationalism—a policy which is crystallised in the history of the first two-thirds of this century—a period marked by war, revolution and murder on an unprecedented scale, but a period marked also by the emergence of the organs of a World Government. Yet to the untrained observer, the events of all these years have an episodic appearance: the appearance is, for example, of *two* world wars, one due to the Kaiser, the other to Hitler, whereas the reality is one world war in two phases, brought about by manipulation by an International Power. What Power?

At first sight, militant national power appears to be the major force in history; but if there is a power which can bring nations into military conflict, it is a superior power. Is there such a power, and where, if anywhere, is it located?

IV

It was Douglas’s great achievement to discover the relation between Finance, Centralisation, and World Hegemony. Until the outbreak of the first phase of war, money appeared to be mere mechanism. But the arrangements made to finance the war revealed to Douglas that the money system was in fact the vehicle of a policy, and that that policy was the centralisation of power leading progressively to World Government. Prior to the outbreak of war, Great Britain was the centre (but not the *being*) of world financial control; with the war financial control was transferred to New York and from there used to dismantle the British Empire which, by reason of British traditions and the Anglo-Saxon character, had been the great barrier to World Dominion by those operating through the world financial system. The fall of the British Empire is a financial accomplishment, not a military one. But the terms of ‘peace’ imposed on ‘victorious’ Britain are those

which might have been expected following military defeat.

But the Power which emerged into the open in this century had its birth long before that. It was incubated (but not conceived) in the Secret Societies of Europe, appeared briefly in the French Revolution, and spread to Britain in the form of Fabianism, and to America in the form of various Socialist societies. Following the first phase of the war, it openly took over Russia, and since has visibly spread as International Communism until it has taken over the greater part of the globe.

V

Current history, which still so often looks episodic, is in fact the culminating stages of a very long-term policy moving internationally, but visible only in the long perspective of time. It is to overcome the episodic view that the Notes appearing mainly under the heading "From Week to Week" have been published almost continuously in *The Social Crediter*. Those included in the present volume are from recent issues. A further volume, consisting of Notes written by Douglas during and after the second phase of war, is projected—both volumes are published in the hope that in this form they will contribute to a better understanding of the predicament we are in and of the catastrophe which faces us.

BRYAN W. MONAHAN.

Canberra,
December, 1968.

The Moving Storm

There is higher authority than ours for the observation that though one rose from the dead, yet would they not believe. Yet, to take only the period of history covered by the three hundred years since Cromwell, the evidence for the existence of a conscious, organised Evil Purpose in the world appears so overwhelming that it would seem axiomatic that mankind could have no prior interest than to root out its Incarnations wherever found. Yet, so far as we can judge there is general though not universal apathy on the subject, and where there is not, the concern lacks focus.

It is probable that one factor in this situation is the identification of nations with the policies they appear to pursue. For nearly two hundred years, Germany has been the embodiment of this Evil Power, yet it is not intrinsically German. Russia appears to compete with the United States for possession of the Banners of Hell yet Russians, as individuals, like Americans, are no doubt good, bad, and indifferent.

The situation is in fact not greatly dissimilar to the group psychology explored by Gustave le Bon in such books as *Psychologie de Peuples*, and, recognising this, we can see that a nation, considered as a group, is not rational; it is a force, not an intelligence; and therefore one nation or group after another can be used and manipulated by a concentrated Supernatural, Conscious Intelligence. The geographical shift of the Storm Centre in Europe from Spain to France, via Holland and England to Germany, and now to Russia is paralleled by the shift of certain activities, largely but not wholly Financial. This Storm Centre has, of course, its secondaries, its "Fifth Column" everywhere.

"Britain" is now apparently the target of the most venomous hatred by its manipulators, a position we have usurped from Imperial Russia; and the practical lesson to be learnt from this analysis is to direct our attention to the current Storm Centre. It is not in Russia, except as a fulcrum for Wall Street; Russia is finished; it is in New York.

—C. H. DOUGLAS (Sept. 11, 1948.)
(*Republished* Jan. 28, 1967.)

Under the heading "Secret Ballot", the following letter appeared in *Truth* (England), Dec. 13, 1946, and was later reprinted in *The Social Crediter*:

SIR,—Your correspondent, Mr. Clifford Rivington, appears to overlook a number of factors, many of them highly technical, which make it altogether too superficial to "agree that a genuinely secret ballot is the bedrock of political freedom". It may easily be exactly the reverse. The first of these factors was the fundamental cause of the American Revolution, and it is operating in this country today. It is the assumption that anyone can vote about anything, or anybody, and that a genuine mandate is thereby conferred upon Parliament, which Parliament can delegate to a Cabinet, upon which it confers the right to legislate without limitation by Common Law, or as the American colonists called it, "natural" law.

"The Common Good", always invoked by tyrants, is the excuse given for the transfer by a legal process, which inverts the protection given by Common Law, of privileges acquired by individuals to a bureaucracy subject to a junta whose primary concern is to retain power. The secret ballot is a most ingenious method of facilitating this process by attributing power to an electorate which cannot exercise it, and suffers collectively, not for its unidentifiable vote, but for the deterioration of morale which always accompanies the divorce of power from responsibility. Many, if not most, of our political premises demand serious reconsideration; and the real nature of our so-called democracy stands high upon the list.

C. H. DOUGLAS.
(*Republished* July 15, 1967.)

* * *

"Western civilisation, which had expanded without notable recession until in 1914 its domain was very nearly the world, began in 1917 a retreat, or contraction, that has so far been uninterrupted.

“The losses are ponderable, beginning with one set that it is not ideologically chic to make much of in liberal assemblies: the huge amount of Western property, much of it in land, factories and mines, that has been stolen by the revolutionaries, or abandoned by the Western owners. The political and strategic losses are of more lasting and fundamental significance.

“The East European marches of the West; the great harbour of Trincomalee, commanding the western flank of the Bay of Bengal, South-East Asia and the Strait of Malacca; the mighty ports of Dakar and Casablanca, looming over the Atlantic passage; the guardian bases of the North African littoral, Europe’s southern flank; the ports and staging areas of the Middle East and East Africa guarding the Indian Ocean; Suez, the Canal and the Isthmus, water passage from Europe to Asia, land bridge between Asia and Africa; the key air base at Kamina in Katanga, air power axis of sub-Saharan Africa; the system of American-built bases in Africa’s north-west salient into the Atlantic, hub of a great wheel holding within its compass all north and central Africa, the Near East, and Europe right out to the Urals, and linked at its western rim with the Americas— all abandoned.

“As in every great historical turn, the symbols are there to be seen by all who are willing to look: the Europeans fleeing by the hundreds of thousands from Morocco, Tunisia, Algeria; the British Viceroy’s palace in Delhi taken over by a Brahman mass leader posing as a parliamentarian; the crescent replacing the cross over the cathedrals of Algiers and Constantine; the mass rape of European women in central Africa, the elaborate killing of European men, the mass feasts on dismembered European bodies; the ostentatious reversion of non-Western leaders, in public, to non-Western clothes; the Western warships pulling out of Dakar, Bombay, Suez, Trincomalee; the many conferences and palavers from which the representatives of the West but not the Communists are excluded; the deliberate public insolence to soldiers, diplomats and wandering citizens of the West.”

The above is from an article by James Burnham in the *Sunday Telegraph*, London, Nov. 1, 1964, based on the last chapter of his book, *Suicide of the West*, to be published by Johnathan Cape in February. What we have quoted represents simply the fulfilment of Lenin’s (if it was Lenin’s) strategy.

If the relationship between Christian Western Civilisation and the International Communist Conspiracy (Red Fascism) were called, and treated as, War, instead of as Cold War, or Peaceful Coexistence, this situation so succinctly summarised by Professor Burnham would be recognised as a series of most devastating defeats for the West. The Conspiracy has gained victories which, had they been gained by Hitler, would have had a “Churchill” exhorting us to an unprecedented outpouring of sweat, sacrifice and blood. But the word “treason” is reserved to characterise Rhodesia, should it attempt to preserve itself against “mass feasts on dismembered European bodies”. In “war”, the loss of a few battleships is a disaster; but in “cold war” the loss of the bases from which battleships operate is celebrated by salutations to the enemy’s flags.

What, do you suppose, Communists from all over the world discuss when they meet in secret conclaves to “celebrate the anniversary of the Russian Revolution”? Probably, the menu for the banquet. What else?

(Nov. 21, 1964.)

* * *

On May 20th a group of some three hundred people, led by about twenty interstate Protestant clergy, held a silent meeting before Parliament House, Canberra, to protest against *apparent* U.S.A. policy in Vietnam, and the Australian government’s support of this policy. This would not be of much importance, except that it requires considerable arrangement, and thus points to the existence of an organisation on an interstate level; and that it conforms to similar protests all over the world.

It is quite likely that the fate of the world now depends on the outcome in Vietnam, and a major objective of the Communist conspiracy within and without the U.S. is to make an American collapse or withdrawal credible. American public opinion, which increasingly recognises the real issue, must be suitably prepared for an ‘accident’ which, one way or another, will render America’s position untenable. And then, with the inevitable, and probably rapid collapse of the whole of Asia, there will seem to be no alternative to

the negotiated surrender of America to Communism, or whatever name the Finance-Communist Conspiracy chooses to give its World Government over the enslaved populations of the globe—what are left of them after potential ‘saboteurs’ have been eliminated.

American Opinion, May 1965, carries an article, cast in the form of a story, which quotes quite extensively from official ‘studies’ of the problems of disarmament. For the most part these deal with the activities of the Disarmament Agency, whose duty is to prevent any possible re-armament, and even to detect any individuals or groups (including local administrations) who might be contemplating re-armament. The selection of types to be used for an international police force, and the methods to be used by the Agency in examining suspects, read like passages out of George Orwell's *1984*. Yet these ‘studies’ have been prepared by quite prominent people.

There is little doubt that involvement, sometimes perhaps even unconscious involvement, in the ramifications of the conspiracy leads in many cases to mental aberration; an inability to perceive the real meaning and effect of what is proposed in the name of apparently noble objectives, such as World Peace. But others, of course, know well enough what it is all about. They know that the Conspiracy at this stage is more likely to succeed than to be defeated, and think themselves safer on the inside than the outside, no matter how much *international* “police brutality” may be involved in making that victory permanent. Not a few, of course, will be disillusioned, as were the original Bolsheviks in Russia. Idealists in particular are a menace to the inner core of the Conspiracy—those “less than four hundred men”, all known to each other, and appointing their own successors—since, not grasping the real meaning and intention of the Conspiracy, they have their own personal hopes and ambitions, their own pictures of the world as it ought to be. They do not understand that the Conspiracy is made up of layer upon layer of deception and treachery.

The threat to Western civilisation is now palpable, and on every hand there are increasing signs of awakening and apprehension. The task is to focus public attention on the true cause of our disasters. *Treason in high places*. So now we have come to “one specific and material end”—the determined exposure of the Conspiracy. “The only effective force by which any objective can be attained is in the last analysis the human will, and if an organisation . . . can keep the will of all its component members focused on the objective to be attained, the collective power available is clearly greater than can be attained by any other form of association.” (C. H. Douglas)

Everybody now knows that only the armed forces of the U.S.A. can at this stage possibly stop Communism. But what too few people understand is that the government which controls these forces is heavily penetrated by traitors, whose objective is to disarm the U.S. while keeping up the appearance of confrontation. And that is the vital fact on which public opinion *must* be focused, so that concentrated and informed public opinion may make further betrayal impossible, and then reverse the consequences of past treachery. There *is* a war on, and the Communists are winning it. But America *could* win, and America’s government must be made to win. It was not Goldwater that the Conspiracy was afraid of—it was that their men in key positions were likely to be kicked out and exposed by reactivated Congressional Committees of Inquiry. It is not likely that another Goldwater will get another chance; but an informed public opinion would be more certainly effective than any Goldwater. An informed public opinion is our sole chance of survival at this stage.

It is true that the actual battle-front now lies in the U.S.A.; but traitors occupy high positions in every country, and are the cause of the mounting world disorder. Persistence in financial policies which keep us on the brink of economic disaster make the activities of traitors in other areas of government all the more fruitful, and promote the ever-increasing centralisation which is the mechanism of eventual world government. So that intensive exposure of the methods, and, so far as they are known, the personnel of the Conspiracy, is the order of the day. As Tom Anderson said in a speech to the American Association of Physicians and Surgeons: “There is a burgeoning grass roots rebellion developing in this country. Millions of alarmed and awakened Americans have now gone to work to save our Republic from becoming a Socialist-Union-Welfare dictatorship which is surrendering piecemeal to the Communist-dominated United Nations. . . . It won’t be saved from the top down, but from the bottom up. . . .”

And as Douglas said in 1948: “If we are not faced with a long-term policy our position is quite

hopeless. . . . But if we are facing a Satanic policy, our position, though very serious [it is desperately more serious today] is not necessarily irremediable. . . . Politics embody strategies; you do not fight strategies, you fight the human beings who are carrying out that strategy. . . . The best defence is attack. Do you propose to allow your enemy a monopoly of it? . . . If we grasp the fact that the essence of Communism, which is the politics of the World State, is centralised vesting of the planet in an organisation expropriating and cutting across all local and personal sovereignty, we cannot be much in error if we identify internationalists, open and concealed, with treason to the individual and his race and country. It is faith that moves mountains. . . .” (T.S.C., May 22, 1948.)

* * *

Far more facts concerning the Conspiracy, its methods, achievements and personnel, are available now than were in 1948; perhaps enough identification has been done, and facts elicited to rout the Conspiracy—provided they become widely enough known and in sufficient time.

In 1954 James Burnham published his book *The Web of Subversion*. This is a documented exposure of the penetration into every area of the United States government, and other organisations, of agents of the Conspiracy. In it he says: “It is impossible to act effectively in relation to the web of subversion without a sufficient knowledge of its history, nature, and methods. Until recently there were few persons in this country (outside the web) who had this knowledge. It is only natural, therefore, that until recently there was little effective counteraction.” He also writes: “The methods of investigation, legal action and exposure that have brought about this improvement in our defenses will continue in use.” In this, he was largely wrong. The Conspiracy reacted strongly to such exposure as had been effected. At the time of the great Congressional enquiries, many witnesses refused to answer vital questions on the ground of the Fifth Amendment to the U.S. Constitution, which allows witnesses to decline to answer questions where such answers would tend to incriminate them. Nevertheless, such refusals carry obvious implications, and the investigating committees were able to draw the appropriate conclusions from the general weight of the evidence. But early in 1954 the Executive Department of the U.S. government issued an Executive Order that witnesses need not answer questions *unless they had been instructed to do so* by a letter from the Executive Department. This has made the sort of investigations which had previously been undertaken by the Committees virtually futile.

But there is still the investigative work of the F.B.I., and occasional defections from the Conspiracy, with subsequent disclosures of vital information, and the vital necessity is to create an increasing climate of opinion to support investigation and disclosure.

In one sense, the defeat of the Conspiracy is still possible, and even, perhaps, near at hand. But against this must be set the fact that the Conspiracy, after innumerable decades, and probably centuries, of patient and cunning contrivance, is almost at its culmination, and now commands such immense power and organisation that it is bound to make the final desperate act to consolidate forever its position. For this reason, its control of the organs of mass communication constantly present a false picture of the world situation, so that it appears far less dangerous than it actually now is.

Militant and informed anti-Communism is *not* a negative strategy. It is the only practicable *positive* first step to rectifying the present disaster. It is all the more practicable in that the objective of effort is now far more definitely visible than it was in the war years, when Douglas first urged action on such lines: “This, I think, exactly defines the task which society must face and solve, or perish. *First*, to attack and defeat the Money Power [i.e., the *individuals* who exert that power—*vide* earlier quotation]; *then* consider the reorganisation of the money *system*.” There is no slightest sign that were Douglas alive today, he would not alter that priority. His early efforts were to avoid the present eventuality, which is now the last resort.

(June 5, 1965.)

* * *

A correspondent writes: “While I appreciate the drive for realism, and I do not underrate the serious nature of the present world situation, I believe there is only one answer, namely, real Christianity, which, of

course, includes complete trust in the Almighty.... I believe that without this vital trust, no effort of ours to avert disaster will ultimately prevail. I should welcome some such admission in your News Sheet.”

We cannot answer our correspondent’s request better than in the words of the late C. H. Douglas, published in this journal nineteen years ago:

“The speech of the Earl of Darnley in the House of Lords on July 10, 1946, affords an outstanding instance of a little recognised, but formidable problem. Perfect in form and manner, it was a moving appeal for the replacement of Power Politics by the Christian Ethic and the Golden Rule. Where, it may be asked, is there any problem in that, other than one of wholesale conversion? Let us, in order to elucidate the difficulty, compare Christianity to the Theory of Thermo-Dynamics, and assume for the purposes of the argument, that all the essentials of that theory were widely known two thousand years ago. It is not difficult to imagine that those who grasped the implications of it might say ‘Here is the key to a better society. Here is the title-deed to a leisure world. Disregard all else, and apply thermodynamics.’ Remember that we are assuming that James Watt was still to be born. And the world at large would have said ‘This man says the magic word is Thermo-Dynamics. Crucify him.’

“Now the fact, which ought to be patent to anyone, is that it is the Policy of a Philosophy which is important (because it is the *evidence* of things not seen): and that Thermo-Dynamics means nothing without Heat Engines, and Christianity means nothing without the Incarnation. You cannot drive a dynamo with Boyle’s Law, or the *Queen Elizabeth* with Joule’s Equivalent. This country is not now the Policy of a Christian Philosophy, and before it can again, as an organisation, put into practice *successfully* those Christian principles, for which Lord Darnley pleads, it must understand their application through proper mechanisms—not so simple a matter as he would appear to think it is. Failing that, the children of this world are, *in their generation*, wiser than the children of Light. Chivalry, ‘Manners makyth Man’, were imperfect Christianity: ‘The Century of the Common Man’ is not.”

* * *

Equally, we may add, Collectivism means nothing without *its* incarnation—the Devil Incarnate. Socialism is the Policy of Collectivism, and is incarnated in the *active* Socialists, Communists, and One-Worlders. Socialism as a theory would mean nothing if it did not inspire Socialists to the activities which have brought about “the serious nature of the present world situation”. The Communists may have complete faith in the materialist theory of history, the winds of change, and the wave of the future, and invoke Marx, Lenin and Stalin; but they *incarnate* their faith in bombings, murders and conspiracies; in subversion and corruption; in the long-range destruction of such Christian Civilisation as we had achieved. As Douglas so often said: “*Demon est Deus Inversus.*”

It is true, in our opinion, that “real Christianity” is the only one answer; but what that answer means is perhaps best summed up in the words of the old hymn: *Onward Christian Soldiers*. Faith may move mountains—through individuals utilising high-explosives and bulldozers. If God is to save the world, it must be *through* saviours, their faith and works.

(July 17, 1965.)

* * *

In July of each year since 1958 the magazine *American Opinion* has published a “Scoreboard” of Communist influence in all the countries of the world. Too many people still regard Communism as a military threat emanating from Russia, and, to a lesser extent, from China—a threat mitigated to some degree by the supposed ‘split’ between those two countries. It is only necessary to imagine that Russia and China proclaimed their identity of purpose in every respect to realise that public opinion, particularly in the U.S.A., would demand realistic policies and actions to end the threat; but as things are, we hardly dare confront China for fear of ending the ‘thaw’ in our relations with Russia—not to mention the threat to our growing ‘trade’, which is the name we give to strengthening our enemies.

In fact, however, Communism is not a military confrontation. It is an international conspiracy,

organised in every country of the world. It is a sort of many-tentacled octopus, the movements of the tentacles being co-ordinated from a central nervous system, the main part of which is almost certainly located in the great international banking houses of New York. Subsidiary centres of co-ordination exist in each country.

The real spread of Communism is in the extent to which these centres exert control over local populations, so that increasing centralisation of government is an advance in Communist objectives, even when such centralisation is merely called socialism, or even 'democratic' socialism. Most of this extension is the result of the penetration first of the schools and universities and, much later, of the governing bureaucracies, by Fabian-type socialists: we are seeing the fruit of the policy of financing the London School of Economics "to train the bureaucrats who will run our future socialist state". Since that policy was enunciated, many generations of students have been indoctrinated in theories which make socialism seem natural and inevitable. From among these students and graduates suitable personnel are recruited into the more secret ramifications of the apparatus—that is to say, they are made conscious to varying degrees of the real intention of socialism; and some come to realise that short of full total government control, there is almost certain to be resistance to government. Such resistance they call counter-revolution, and come to realise' the necessity of using force to suppress it.

Thus to assess the Communist menace it is necessary to estimate the degree of control the conspiracy *tout court* exercises in every country—degree of control being best designated as a percentage. It is this that the "Scoreboard" does.

Over the years since its inception, the Scoreboard has shown a marked increase in overall control. The rate of advance has varied from country to country, and in some areas control has actually diminished—usually only temporarily. The estimates given are the result of "thousands of hours of the most careful research by our correspondents on six continents"; they now show that the Conspiracy is about four-fifths of the way to total success.

On the face of it, our situation now would appear to be hopeless. But as an article in *American Opinion* points out: "in every country in which the Conspiracy has not attained complete control of the army and the police, the Conspiracy's control depends on deceit—massive, universal deceit. . . . Power that is exercised by deceit is power that can be destroyed by exposure." That is, if those who know what we are up against will teach those who do not, and those who do not will make the effort to learn. Enough of the whole story has now been pieced together, and supported by testimony from those who one way or another have been involved in some of the inner mechanics of the Conspiracy, for conviction to be possible to any normally intelligent person who will take the time and trouble to read and assimilate the evidence now available.

Early in his work, the late C. H. Douglas realised that International Finance was essentially a conspiracy. Marxian Communism never pretended to be anything else. To students of the matter, it was clear enough that Fabian Socialism was a conspiracy, of an apparently more respectable kind. But it has only relatively recently become clear that these three are only three aspects of one Conspiracy, by which the power of Finance has penetrated and taken over the overt mechanisms of government, using Fabian-type socialists (conscious and unconscious—i.e., brainwashed—) to effect the penetration of organisations and government instrumentalities, and Communists to exploit the economic and political disorders promoted by false economic theories and eventually to provide the secret police of the ultimate totalitarian world state.

There are now many countries where Communism is in full control; but the primary target of the Conspiracy is Christian civilisation, and many of the countries captured so far have been taken mainly in order to deprive the so-called West of their use and resources, and in the course of a general outflanking movement which with the fall of South Vietnam will be complete. So the main interest of the Scoreboard is how the score stands for us.

The figures given relate not to popular support of, but to the degree of control exercised by the Conspiracy. Averaging the scores for the countries of Europe, we get a figure of 40-50%; but key countries such as France (70-90%) and Italy (70-90%) are much higher. Britain is listed now as 60-80%; Australia 20-40%; New Zealand 20-30%; and Canada 60-80%.

The most important score, of course, is that for the U.S.A., for the U.S.A. is the headquarters for the present at least of the heart of the Conspiracy, and it is also the only country which at this stage could destroy the Conspiracy.

The score is 60-80%. If this figure seems incredible, remember that if Communism is to be defeated, a beginning must be made somewhere, and for all its power, the U.S.A. has nowhere made that beginning. The reason is not inability, but because the Conspiracy is in control at the top policy-making levels. Thus the Cuba missile crisis was devised to give Cuba an American guarantee against invasion; the Vietnam war is being conducted on a no-win basis; and thousands of U.S. Marines were poured into Santa Dominica to ensure that the military did not obtain control of the situation, while President Johnson sought 'advice' from professed Latin American Communists (Juan Bosch and Betancourt).

The final and total success of the Conspiracy is now certain unless real and drastic steps are taken to defeat it. The first and most important is to get rid of the gang of 'advisers' who have made the President of the U.S.A. their captive. The next would be, were it possible, to clean up the mass communications media. As it is not, alternative methods of reaching public opinion need to be exploited as rapidly and effectively as possible. Those who know the truth about the present situation are an army—the only army of any account now—opposed to the Conspiracy. But if they will not fight—by making the truth known—they will be destroyed by the usual Red methods, to make "counter-revolution" impossible.

(July 31, 1965.)

* * *

The weekly newspaper, *Human Events* (Washington) in its issue for July 17, 1965, quotes what we believe to be the very reliable *Allen-Scott Report* on what took place at the Hanoi "labour conference" held from June 2-6 inclusive, and attended by delegates from all over the world. According to the Report, the conference cost the Hanoi- Peking axis over half a billion dollars.

"Nothing was left to the imagination of the 600 delegates. *Country by country* they were briefed on how to implement the 'vigorous mass aid Viet Nam and resist America movement' which the hosts said 'is unfolding throughout the world'. This labour conference obviously was vital to Mao's strategy." [Our emphasis.]

The conference was, in fact, a briefing in integrated sabotage as appropriate to the various countries represented, in the main aimed at disrupting transport and promoting antiwar demonstrations. And so we have seen the Teach-ins and other propaganda activities, combined with water-front strikes and other attacks on communications.

In the meantime, the U.S. refrains from bombing vital targets, but terrifies the public with postponed announcements of vastly increased military efforts—probably made in the secure knowledge that the Communists will have won before the efforts can be effective. The 'management' of the news concerning Vietnam ought to be enough to convince anyone of the complicity of the invisible government of the U.S.A. in the strategy of International Communism. And when our turn comes, it will be "too late" for the U.S. to do anything.

It is vital to do everything possible to inform public opinion to a point where it will *force* the U.S. government to *win* the *war* against Communism. Conferences with a winning enemy are merely steps in a pattern of surrender.

(Aug. 14, 1965.)

* * *

Writing in the *Daily Telegraph* of Aug. 8, 1965, "Peter Simple" comes to much the same conclusion regarding world events as did the late C. H. Douglas more than twenty years ago. Douglas said that there were only two alternative explanations of our disasters—that they were the outcome of sheer idiocy on the part of our rulers (in which case our position was irremediable), or they were the outcome of a long-term policy (i.e., a conspiracy), in which case our position, while desperate, may be remedied, since a conspiracy

when recognised can be dealt with.

“Peter Simple” says it is difficult not to fit the steps by which “this country” has come to its present pass into the conspiracy theory: the sudden flood of coloured immigration; the surrender of territories all over the world to “not particularly friendly people who may be succeeded by positively hostile ones”; opinion formation which has made “amoralism, nihilism, and even treason” fashionable; support of a “more than dubious internationalism”; the “outrage” of the proposed abolition of the Territorial Army. “Peter Simple” says he doesn’t suppose there is a conspiracy, but concludes that our rulers must be so “abysmally stupid” that they have only the vaguest idea, if any, of what they are doing: what he calls a depressing and alarming alternative.

Of course, it all depends on who “our rulers” are. “Peter Simple” distinguishes between the rulers “of the past few years”, and our present ones—a distinction we do not concede. *Some* of the personnel *administering* a policy which has been demonstrably coherent for at least the whole of this century thus far, and visibly coherent since say the end of the Second World War, have changed; but have those ever been our real rulers? The broadest name for this policy is internationalism, and internationalism implies the destruction of nationalism, which is exactly what has been happening.

But at this stage it is not necessary to theorise. Communism, for example, openly proclaims itself as a policy of internationalism; the policy of the Royal Institute for International Affairs is internationalism; so is that of the American Council for Foreign Relations, and of the great International Banking houses, and the United Nations. In fact, the “plot” has now reached more the status of an open secret. It is true that in 1931 Professor Toynbee, the Secretary of the Royal Institute of International Affairs, regarded their activity in undermining national sovereignty as a secret except to initiates: “What we do with our hands we deny with our lips”. But times have changed, and Professor Toynbee now openly advises the U.S. to get out of South Vietnam (which they intend to do anyway) “even if this means a Communist government”. After all, it is a step in the international direction, another national sovereignty absorbed into an international government.

If there is any difficulty in comprehending the present situation, it lies in believing it could have come about through stupidity, though no doubt knaves have made good use of fools.

(Aug. 28, 1965.)

* * *

The only uncompromisingly anti-Communist countries now left are Portugal, Spain, South Africa, and Rhodesia. Communist or, if the term is preferred, Internationalist control over the rest of the world is so advanced that no other real nationalist initiative remains possible. With every week that passes, the stranglehold of the Washington-Moscow axis is intensified.

This situation has been brought about, in the main, by Fabianism—the steady, consistent, but gradual application of the policy of centralisation, proceeding in the first place through financial policy and in the second through the growth in power and monopoly of ‘federal’ governments. At the present time we are witnessing the culminating phase in the frenzied rounds of international consultations to ‘integrate’ defences, not-win the war in Vietnam, contain China, and disarm in favour of the United Nations. All that remains now is to mop up the remaining pockets of resistance, and the beginning has been made with Rhodesia by provoking the Smith government into an overt act of resistance, which in due course can be put down by force. This vile act of the Wilson regime demonstrates with fearful clarity how firmly once-Great Britain is in the grip of the internationalists.

It is true that for a long time there has been little to choose between the Tories and the Socialists—so far as the Common Man is concerned. But the grim campaign to get rid of Macmillan and destroy the morale of the Tories shows that the hidden government at this stage requires the vindictive ruthlessness of a Wilson and the naked hatreds of his left-wing extremists who are waiting for the day when bombs will fall on Salisbury. For that is what public ‘opinion’ is being prepared for, with the co-operation of the Press, the B.B.C., the Bank “of England”, and the American establishment. We are to learn that effective resistance to internationalism is a crime punishable by death. And the second lesson to be learned is that “one man one

vote” has pretty well accomplished its mission in Britain by installing a dictatorship—not of, but through Mr. Wilson. And at the rate things are now going, it looks to be not long before “rebellion” at home will be an act punishable by death. If this seems far-fetched, remember Cuba. Everywhere the prelude to disaster has been the attitude “it can’t happen here”. So thought, in recent times, the Algerians, the Katanganese (slaughtered by the U.N.), and the Cubans.

(March 12, 1966.)

* * *

Political Intelligence Weekly (London), Feb. 18, 1966, finds it incredible “that any individual with such a Communist-front background [as Arthur Goldberg] could successively become a justice of the US Supreme Court and an American Ambassador to the UN, especially when the US Government is taking on Communism in Vietnam”.

We do not find it incredible. It is in fact a brazen display of the power of the Conspiracy. The picture of the world now is one of the steady emergence into openly exercised power of a World Government which, for decades past, has secretly pulled the strings attached to nations from concealed positions of power—mainly financial power. The international control of credit and exchange has meant the control of national governments, which have thus been constrained to follow economic and trade policies which have led to wars and centralisation of power in institutions at the cost of the liberty of individuals.

(March 12, 1969.)

* * *

The late C. H. Douglas once wrote of the Financier-Communist Conspiracy as one which cared no more for the immolation of the peoples of a continent than for the death of a sparrow. Whether he had Africa specifically in mind we do not know: he wrote before the winds of change were unleashed by Macmillan. But that the Africans are in for immolation has been evident for some time.

For thousands of years the black Africans lived in a complex tribal society which had evolved to suit a temperament adjusted to tropical living. By *our* standards their condition was no doubt appalling; but not by theirs. Perhaps the best way to gain an appreciation of the native outlook and way of life is to read Joyce Carey’s novel *The African Witch*. The endemic diseases and hazards of life which restrained the teeming population growth were taken by the natives as part of the natural order.

To replace all this with a modern agricultural and industrial, urban, civilisation is a matter of the gravest delicacy, requiring, perhaps, centuries. It is essentially an organic process, growing outwards from a number of centres and leaving as undisturbed as possible the complex tribal life until growth and change are able gradually to extend. Even the controlling of endemic diseases creates dangerous problems for the natives, since it increases the rate of population growth beyond the ability of the natives to increase food production. And education, by eroding the tribal structure which is the foundation of the native natural order, opens the way to demagoguery; and this in turn leads to incitement to discontent, and disruption of otherwise stable societies which, however they appear in our eyes, have sufficed the needs of the natives for untold generations.

Now whatever the original motives, and even methods, of the deliberately maligned ‘colonialism’ which appeared in Africa, it was in essence an organic growth. Its methods evolved by adaptation to the problems presented by the stages of development. And one thing that is quite certain is that as the replacement of tribalism by organised agriculture, communication, and industrialisation proceeded, integration of the native into the complex was inevitable—for merely mathematical reasons. ‘Government’, in these delicately difficult circumstances, must necessarily be government of ability; and as complexity extends, so the field of recruitment must extend, as perhaps is best demonstrated in the Portuguese overseas territory of Angola.

There are really only two practicable alternatives in Africa: to leave the continent alone (which has not been done); and *benevolent* colonialism—that is to say, a slow organic change proceeding by adaptation and

evolution according to the emerging possibilities.

Colonialism, whatever its beginnings, was indeed becoming increasingly benevolent. And anti-colonialism was in its inception an openly declared Communist strategy to bring down European civilisation everywhere.

All this, of course, was and is known to the power, the invisible world government, which operates through international finance and Communism. Self-government at this time for the 'nations' of Africa is impossible; what appears to have been achieved so far in that regard has been the result of the momentum generated by the colonisers. That momentum is visibly dying down, and every successive disruption of government brakes the momentum the more.

Thus the destruction of the native Africans, according to the satanic plan to exploit the wealth of Africa in the service of a World Government, is now inevitable unless that World Government is exposed, challenged, and defeated in the little time left before "none dare call it treason". If the Rhodesia Front government is destroyed, one of the few last bastions from which challenge is possible will be gone.

(March 12, 1966.)

* * *

A graph published in the London *Times* on March 31, 1966, showed that in mid-1965 British currency reserves (gold and foreign currencies less liabilities) fell below zero, from a fairly steady average up to mid-1964 of about £1,000 million. According to orthodox economic theory, therefore, British money is now completely without value. To maintain the fiction that it still has value, international loans have been obtained; but this means that Britain has lost the last vestige of even apparent power of independent initiative: Wilson is nothing but the broker's man. The fact that he enjoys the position (after all, it *is* a position), and exults in pursuing internationalist villains, is irrelevant. Anyone occupying the same position would be under the same absolute orders, because Britain can be reduced to absolute economic chaos within 24 hours. Britain depends first of all on *imports* (unlike Rhodesia), and therefore an international declaration that sterling was no longer recognised as an international currency would deprive Britain of the ability to buy essential imports—food and oil. And, Mr. Wilson having conveniently set the example, it is undoubtedly true that any attempt to evade the economic sanctions which, of course, depend on economic orthodoxy, by recourse to unorthodox, but realistic, economics, would be met by the threat or use of international force. Bankrupts can be thrown into prison.

The present position has been implicitly true since World War 1; but up till roughly the mid-thirties could have been rectified. Since the mid-thirties, rectification has become progressively less possible; but the fact that the final crash has come in less than a year (it began under the 'Conservative' administration, and has continued *at the same rate* under Labour), is a reliable indication that the time has come to demonstrate the reality of international government and power.

In the same way, it has been known for a long time that de Gaulle has been carrying out Communist objectives; but his now open destruction of NATO is simply the declaration that the conquest of Europe is complete.

All this would be painfully obvious to all people of reasonable intelligence who kept themselves informed of the main developments were it not for the operation of the greatest deception of the many current—that the U.S.A. is anti-Communist—a deception sustained undoubtedly by a degree of wishful thinking that closes the intellect to the acceptance of quite patent and elementary facts. Including U.S. economic aid (which is widely recognised to have done more harm than good), *every* U.S. strategic action has been in conformity with Communist objectives, even to open collaboration with the U.S.S.R. in the Suez crisis, which marked Britain's final military defeat. Let no one suppose that the U.S.A. is fighting Communism in Vietnam. We stated before it occurred that when the U.S.A. stepped up its military operations in that country it would be a sign that all possibility of a stable South Vietnamese government had been eliminated, so that, after a show of force, the Americans could declare the situation hopeless, and convincingly accept an invitation to leave the country. Now, only a few days ago, a B.B.C. Washington

reporter stated that spokesmen for the U.S. administration privately admitted that the civil disturbances in Vietnam were restricting the American war effort and that they were concerned that a new government, including members of the Viet Cong, would be formed and would invite the U.S.A. to get out (leaving the huge American-built bases, and vast quantities of American military and other equipment, for the use of the Chinese in their conquest of Indonesia, Singapore, Malaysia, New Zealand and Australia). And what is left then for the U.S.A. but an 'accommodation' with the U.S.S.R. to set up a world government? The Australian Minister for External Affairs has just said, after his briefing in Washington, "the greatest problem facing the world is to persuade the Chinese to join the community of nations and live in peace with their fellow men", or words to that effect. Get it?

Will there be war? Yes, of course—against South Africa, unless that country capitulates before impossible odds.

(May 7, 1969.)

* * *

Peter Simple, who of all political commentators writing in large circulation newspapers writes more realistically than any known to us (how he gets away with it we do not know), asks in the London *Daily Telegraph* of April 12, 1966, concerning Rhodesia: "How has this astounding situation, this obvious contradiction of our national interests, come about? Is it plain doctrinaire lunacy? Or—since that the British Labour Government is collectively insane is hard to believe in spite of all the evidence—is it simply a part of some international bargain, whose terms and ultimate purposes we are not told?"

Well, we hope that Peter Simple does not think that it is just a matter of paying your money and taking your choice—though you pay your money anyway. It is one thing or the other, and while there is plenty of lunacy in the apparent general acceptance of what the 'British' government is doing in the name of the British people, and the idea of lunacy in government is a good deal more realistic than the usual explanation of commentators—that politicians are either stupid or make 'mistakes' that the commentators would not themselves make—the evidence, now abundantly available, of conscious intention in implementation of a 'bargain' is overwhelming. The main intention, of course, lies outside Britain, and Britain is in no bargaining position. But we doubt if Peter Simple would get away with making that, and the reasons for it, plain.

It may be instructive, even if otherwise futile, to review the unorthodox economics and policies which, in the absence of the use of force against her, might extricate Britain from her present disaster.

Britain, Canada, Australia, New Zealand, South Africa and Rhodesia, all English speaking and all stemming from a common cultural tradition, together form not only an immediately viable economic entity, but a potentially immensely prosperous one. Britain, by abandoning the fiction that it is necessary to import international 'money' as a reserve for the provision of internal finance, could by simple book-keeping transactions increase the effective purchasing-power of sterling, thus giving it genuine economic *value*. The rejection of 'international money' would clear the way to realistic trade between the countries enumerated to the extent necessary to distribute resources of materials and skills to the best mutual advantage; not to obtain 'international' money but to facilitate production and distribution in the interest of the individuals comprising the various communities.

This economic realism should be combined on the diplomatic level with a denunciation of international financial orthodoxy, and an exposure of *all* the forces united in maintaining it.

Realistic accountancy, not gold, is the proper 'reserve' for 'money'. So every ounce of gold which can be produced from the countries enumerated should be devoted to paying off international debt, and all 'foreign exchange' derived from the expanded trade which would undoubtedly follow an appreciation in the purchasing-power of sterling should be devoted to the same purpose.

Paying off international debt along these lines may look like an interminable if not impossible task. But in fact a realistic beginning along the lines indicated, combined with diplomatic realism, would bring about

the collapse of the international financial system as at present imposed, probably in a surprisingly short time. International finance in essence is a system of world government, and Communism is its handmaiden(!), and the U.S.A. its bastion. Concerted revolt against it by the English-speaking nations listed would bring about its downfall. For neither of the chief agencies of the world financial government, Washington and Moscow, would contemplate a real world war, and probably neither could survive as such against the enforced exposure of their collusion in opposing a multi-lateral rebellion. They would be destroyed by internal forces in the U.S.A. and the furious uprising of the peoples of Russia's captive satellites.

And that, we fear, is all the comfort we can offer to the anti-fluoridationists.

(May 7, 1966.)

* * *

The London *Evening Standard* of March 7, 1966, carried the following report: "SALISBURY, Monday—A Rhodesian firm of toilet roll manufacturers has threatened legal action against people overprinting its products with a caricature of Mr. Harold Wilson."

And Nigel Lawson in the *Spectator*, March 18, 1966, quotes H. Wilson from *Election Forum, BBC TV*, March 10: "I think we've been a very pragmatic government. We shall remain a pragmatic government." And the *Shorter Oxford English Dictionary*: "Pragmatic: ... 2. Busy, active: *esp.* officiously busy in other people's affairs; interfering, meddling. 3. Opinionated, dictatorial, dogmatic."

As a result of Parliamentary pressure, Mr. Wilson tabled in the House of Commons library the text of a letter dated October 2, 1964, to Dr. E. C. Mutasa, a coloured Rhodesian: "Dear Mr. Mutasa,—Thank you for your letter of September 20th. The Labour Party is totally opposed to granting independence to Southern Rhodesia so long as the government of that country remains under the control of a white minority. We have repeatedly urged the British Government to negotiate a new constitution with all African and European parties represented, in order to achieve a peaceful transition to African majority rule. Yours sincerely, Harold Wilson."

That document, whose existence was known to the Rhodesian Government, was part of the provocation offered to induce a unilateral declaration of independence. We can imagine the further provocations offered in 'conferences' and other pragmatic occasions. Why? To lead to the use of force in Southern Africa. And so it has turned out, despite Mr. Wilson's repeated assurances that he would not use force. And illegally, at that. He asked the United Nations to 'authorise' armed interference in Portugal's trade, but didn't get it. Such authorisation can be given only under Article 27 of Chapter 7 of the UN Charter, which requires that all the permanent members of the Security Council must concur in a decision, but in fact Russia and France abstained, so that Wilson had no mandate, and acted unilaterally.

So we proceed from provocation to piracy, with worse to come.

(May 7, 1966.)

* * *

It is well to be clear as to what our present situation is.

There are two major factors: the threatened population explosion, which will come about as the result of the man-made disturbance of the ecology of the planet; and the waste of the planet's physical resources on an ever-increasing scale which would exhaust many in the course of a few centuries, which is an insignificant time in the span of human history.

We do not delude ourselves that these facts are discoveries of ours. Far-sighted men saw them long ago, and set in train policies designed to safeguard the survival of their own descendants. Operating on the one hand through financial power, and on the other through subversion and conspiracy, they have gradually brought about the present situation, in which we are rapidly being engulfed in revolution and disarmed in favour of World Government with power to ensure its self-survival for as long as history lasts.

So rapid is the approach of the culmination of Conspiracy that resistance to world government is beginning to appear. So the only remaining question is: how much longer will counter-revolution remain possible? And where?

Not in England. As Marx predicted, foreigners have made the revolution for the British, and the final controls are being clamped down now. Anyone who can should read Constantine Fitz Gibbon's *When the Kissing Had to Stop*. It is more applicable to the *present* phase of the British disaster than Orwell's *1984*, which is, perhaps, why, so far as we know, it has gone "out of print".

(June 18, 1966.)

* * *

On May 3, 1966, the Portuguese Minister of Foreign Affairs issued a statement at a Press Conference. It dealt with British conduct in relation to Portugal in connection with the Rhodesian affair, and, allowing for the niceties of diplomatic usage, was as strong a condemnation as could be made.

The Minister also observed that "For the first time in public debate the African countries realised that they are the stake in a vast game that far outstrips them, that they can hardly follow but which is not necessarily identifiable with their real longer-term interests. For the first time the African countries saw that principles, ideals and the very truth were swept aside, so easily, to achieve aims that were closer to the heart of the great powers than of the countries of Africa".

The African countries, yes; but not their peoples. It is the resources of the African continent which interest not so much the "great powers" as the invisible world government, in its dual aspects of Finance and Communism. The peoples of Africa and of Christian civilisation stand in the way of the heart's desire of the International Conspiracy, so in their millions they must perish to clear the way for the Grand Design.

(June 18, 1966.)

* * *

As we meditate on the "mellowing" of Communism (except in China, of course), we would do well to remember Dimitri Manuilski's words: "The bourgeoisie will have to be put to sleep. So we shall begin by launching the most spectacular peace movement on record. . . . The capitalist countries, stupid and decadent, will rejoice to join in their own destruction. They will leap at another chance to be friends. As soon as their guard is down, we will smash them with our clenched fist."

But apparently our idea is to feed the brutes.

(July 16, 1966.)

* * *

"In these pages I ask you—you, the people of the United Kingdom, you people of the older dominions, you people of the United States of America, you people of Europe—and the respective governments of each one of you . . . are you not, perhaps, even as I write, now guilty of, and contemplating yet, the perpetration of that final treason: the unconscious furthering of the ends of evil in the name of all that is most holy?"

These words from the Introduction appear on the cover of *Rhodesia Accuses*, by A. J. A. Peck, a Rhodesian solicitor. This quite excellent book describes the Rhodesian situation from every point of view, and gives the history leading to the Unilateral Declaration of Independence, a history of unquestionable duplicity and deception by successive British governments—if the real government of Britain *is* any longer British.

The essential fact is that the 1961 Constitution was presented to the Rhodesians in the form of two British White Papers. Of these White Papers, it was stated in the House of Commons, on behalf of the Government, that the Constitution to follow would "follow the White Paper in every detail. It will include a few minor points for which provision has to be made, which were not mentioned in the White Papers since these, of necessity, were expressed in layman's language". In opening the Fifth Session of the Ninth

Parliament in Rhodesia His Excellency the Governor, Sir Humphrey Gibb, said: "My ministers have received the clearest assurances from Her Majesty's Government that they cannot revoke or amend the new Constitution."

But one of the "few minor points" was the inclusion of a Section, 111, in the new Constitution providing: "Full power and authority is hereby reserved to Her Majesty by Order in Council to amend, add to or revoke the provisions of Sections, 1, 2, 3, 5, 6, 29, 32, 42, 49. . . . Provided that the power and authority herein reserved to Her Majesty shall not be exercised for the purpose of amending this section or adding to it a reference to any Section of this Constitution not included in this Section on the appointed day." This Section gives the British Government practically unlimited powers of intervention in Rhodesian affairs.

The White Papers, containing no suggestion of Section 111, were approved by Referendum in Rhodesia in the belief, in which Rhodesians were encouraged, that the new Constitution would be in effect the granting of Independence. Mr. Peck characterises this procedure as a squalid confidence trick, and says: "With this despicable hoax so clearly in mind, and with the knowledge that the British Labour Party did not even go so far as to accept the constitutional proposals for Rhodesia as contained in the two White Papers, is it to be wondered at that Rhodesians were not, and are not, disposed to place much reliance upon Mr. Wilson's statement of 11th December, 1965, that he proposed to adhere to those principles 'which have throughout inspired the approach of successive British governments'?"

The Wilson regime has made much play of censorship in Rhodesia, but so far as we know there has been no publicity in Britain for this piece of treachery—a treachery which fully accounts for the lack of confidence felt by the Rhodesians in planning for their future. Nor have we seen anywhere any statement to justify the assertions of the Wilson regime and of the British press that the European Rhodesians intended to perpetuate "White minority rule". Mr. Peck specifically states that the European Rhodesians recognised and accepted that the African Rhodesians would in time predominate in government, their only concern being that this should come about in an orderly way, and that government should remain continuously competent.

Rhodesia Accuses is a damning further piece of evidence that the world is in the grip of a conspiracy, in which the stakes are so high that the only hope for a decent future lies in exposing and punishing the conspirators. We hope Mr. Peck's book* will be given very wide and effective circulation.

(July 30, 1966.)

**Rhodesia Accuses*: Three Sisters Books (Pvt.) Ltd., P.O. Box 2506, Salisbury, Rhodesia. Paperback, 170 pages, 9/6 per copy plus postage. Distributed in Britain and Ireland by Johnson Publications Ltd., 11/14 Stanhope Mews West, London S.W.7.

* * *

In August 1960 we published an article entitled *The Last Chance: A Conspectus*. The Advisory Chairman of the Secretariat, the late Dr. Tudor Jones, approved the article, but thought that perhaps to call it the *last* chance was unduly pessimistic. The article said: "Our last chance lies in facing the fact that there is a ruthless bid for World Hegemony, and in dealing with the conspirators."

As to strategy, the article advised: "The first step should be to estimate what our essential import requirements are, bearing in mind that *a large part of our present (British) imports are merely the raw materials for further exports*, and that others are things we can just as well provide for ourselves, once we have got over the hypnotic belief in the virtue of trade as an end in itself. These necessary imports should then be obtained on the best terms possible.

"This course of action would rapidly bring into the open the real situation we are in, and we should soon see whether it is still possible to extricate ourselves, or whether it is already too late. If we do not do this, the end is certain, so that at least we should be backing a chance against a certainty."

But the economic policies which were predictably leading to the present situation were, if anything, intensified; and the catastrophic further intensification now being applied and promised provides evidence that "the necessary arrangements to put down discontent have been achieved".

It is not an economic theory but an arithmetical certainty that ‘Mr. Wilson’s’ new harsh measures will fail in their *ostensible* objective; but it is an almost equal certainty that they will succeed in their *calculated* objective—the abolition of prosperity, for equal poverty is the indispensable basis of the coming slave state.

If there are still those who believe that the present state of affairs has come about merely through incompetence, we beg them to consider the deliberate destruction of the Tory party, open and visible in the handling of the Profumo scandal, the attack on Mr. Macmillan, and subsequently on Mr. Home. And for ourselves, we should regard Mr. Wilson’s appointment as temporary only.

(July 30, 1966.)

* * *

The London *Spectator* has, over the years, contributed in its own way to the mess in Britain, which, in its issue of August 5, 1966, it describes as follows: “The Prices and Incomes Bill now before the House of Commons, complete with the notorious Part IV, represents the greatest infringement of individual liberty, the biggest departure from the free society, this country has known in the present century except in time of war. . . . There can be little doubt but that in a free vote in the House of Commons it would be, rightly, thrown out by a clear majority. Yet so far from there being a free vote, the Government has refused to allow the new Bill—for that is what, in effect, it is—time to be debated at all, seeking refuge behind a legally sound but morally indefensible piece of procedural trickery that sets almost as unfortunate a precedent as the Bill itself.”

The morally indefensible procedural trickery was of much the same kind as the trickery applied to get the Rhodesians to agree to the 1961 Constitution (see T.S.C., July 30, 1965). The House of Commons approved a stiff Prices and Incomes Bill, but then the Government tacked on Part IV, which in the words of R. A. Cline in the same issue of the *Spectator* is likely to rank “as one of the leading traumatic events in the constitutional and legal life of this country”.

No doubt Mr. Wilson flew to his masters in Washington to let them know how he proposed to implement their orders; and to make sure he would not renege President Johnson staged a luncheon in which he praised Wilson in terms of which Peregrine Worsthorne says (*Sunday Telegraph*, July 31, 1966): “Recollected in tranquility it makes the flesh creep, and it is difficult to know whether to be more shocked by the Texan’s assumption that Britain could be conned in this way, or by Mr. Wilson’s fantastic failure to dissociate himself and his colleagues from these grotesque analogies.”

A credit squeeze is like cutting down the supply of fuel to an internal combustion engine, except that deprivation of money in an industrial economy damages the economy as well, as our enemies fully understand. In the light of current developments, it is difficult to understand how anyone can fail to see the connection between say the U.S. and U.S.S.R. collaboration in the Suez crisis, the betrayal at Nasau, the dismantling of the British defence aircraft industry in favour of projected American aircraft, and the congratulations to Mr. Wilson by the U.S. administration as he embarks on measures which if persisted in will wreck the British economy.

And what does the *Spectator* think of it all? “To have rushed through without proper debate legislation that will produce economic inefficiency and industrial strife, that will seriously impede the vital growth of productivity bargaining and—worst of all—that rides roughshod over basic human freedoms, all for no discernible benefit, is evidence of the clearest and most unequivocal kind that the present Government. . .”

Well, that the Government what?

- has been intimidated by the gnomes of Zurich?
- is intimidated by its left-wing critics?
- at last realises the gravity of the situation?
- is considering the formation of a coalition government?

- is determined to use force in Rhodesia if necessary?
- has no alternative?
- has reached an advanced stage of panic?
- will give further consideration to joining the EEC?
- is in the grip of a conspiracy?
- is suffering the consequences of Rhodesian intransigence?

The correct answer (no prize) according to the *Spectator* is “has reached an advanced stage of panic”, as a result of which “our political and individual liberties . . . are at stake”.

Panic or no, we have certainly reached the stage where our liberties, and probably our lives, are at stake, precisely as predicted by the late Major C. H. Douglas. He gave, for example, an early warning in February, 1926: “You will quite properly feel inclined to ask at this stage of the argument: ‘Are you stating that the condition of affairs in Great Britain is the result of conscious policy aiming at producing the results that we see around us, or are you merely suggesting that British financiers are incompetent?’ If the former, what is the ultimate object of that policy?”

“Taking all these matters into consideration, and having made it my business to observe the course of events in the United States of America, together with what information it is possible to glean in regard to Italy and Russia, I have come to the conclusion that we are witnessing a gigantic attempt, directed from sources which have no geographical nationality, to dispossess a defective democracy, and to substitute a dictatorship of finance for it . . . and I may perhaps say that I think that the elimination of an independent upper middle class is an intermediate objective of that policy.”

Some years later he wrote: “If there is a spark of virility left in this country, the day the next war breaks out the local representatives of Finance will face a firing party in the Long Gallery of the Tower.”

Looking backwards, it can be seen that these warnings have been justified and borne out by events; and to suppose that the present British crisis is not another instalment, indeed culmination, of a persisting policy of which the Great Depression, the Second World War, and the current disarmament of Britain are large component parts is to be wishfully or wilfully blind.

On the other hand, anyone who *does* grasp this essential continuity of a policy whose objective is now visible in its present outcome must also realise that the Conspiracy is not going to give up because we have become aware of what is happening and do not like it. We understand much better now the connection between Finance and Communism, and Communism shows us what happens when discontent, called counter-revolution, begins to be manifest.

(Aug. 27, 1966.)

* * *

“The endless passionate debates about ‘national purpose’ that filled the national newspapers, periodicals and airwaves of his native land foundered on a hard rock that many Americans simply could not bring themselves to acknowledge: that they were up against a basically hostile climate manipulated by an opponent who had no real desire to get along with them.

“This fact, so terrifying in its implications and so demanding of sacrifice and courage if the implications were fully acknowledged, was too much for most Americans— indeed for most Englishmen, or Frenchmen, or any other still hopeful peoples of the West—to face. So they spun out the hurrying months and years of the enemy’s brutal advance assuring one another that they must find a Purpose, while the one purpose that could possibly mean anything at all to themselves, their posterity, or the world—simple survival—was slowly but surely allowed to erode away.”—From the novel *A Shade of Difference*, by Allen Drury.

(Aug. 27, 1966.)

In many respects, the novelist tells us more about contemporary events than do the analysts, for they show through the human emotions and character how policies crystallise into history; they make real and credible the intrigues, the plots, the conspiracies which on their various levels underlie the events which are presented to us as mere episodes of 'news'. They make credible to us the reality of the *management* of the news.

Allen Drury's novel concerns the actual working of the United Nations, told in terms of the personalities and ambitions and posturing of several key figures. But Drury covered the United Nations as a reporter for Washington and New York newspapers, and so must be drawing on experience for the creation of his fictional characters. One of these is an African from a region of Africa for which he demands immediate independence. The M'Bulu's ambitions in this respect are exploited, like Mr. Wilson's (the contemporary Churchill, to paraphrase President Johnson), by more far-sighted manipulators determined on the destruction of Western civilisation.

What of the M'Bulu's background? Read Robert Ruark's *Uhuru*, Nicholas Monserrat's *The Tribe That Lost Its Head*, Joyce Cary's *African Witch*. These make nonsense of the professional commentaries which see Africa in the light of Western party politics, for they see African political realities in terms of the actually existing passions and beliefs of the various peoples of the Dark Continent. Not for the realistic and experienced novelist the notion that "feudalism is fighting the forces of the future" as an A.B.C. commentator put it. The reality and the fight are in the here and now, between a Conspiracy and an eroding Christian civilisation.

(Aug. 27, 1966.)

From time to time, and from various directions, we have been accused of being 'alarmists', and even, by this activity, of helping to bring about an alarming state of affairs. However, if the charge is put in the form that we have been endeavouring to sound the alarm in advance of the events which are now upon us, we admit to the accuracy of the charge, and even, to the extent that we may have succeeded in raising resistance to the conquest of our countries by alien forces, of contributing to the alarming state of affairs which must be the result of resistance rather than passive surrender. But even without us there would be sufficient cause for alarm, for surrender, however passive, is not likely to be peaceful. For Communism has not changed since the day in 1918 when Lenin issued his order to the Cheka: "We are exterminating the bourgeoisie as a class."

Douglas sounded the alarm, ever more urgently. He named one of his books, published in 1931, *Warning Democracy*. The *essence* of Douglas's teaching which, particularly during and after the second phase of the World War, he defined ever more precisely, was that the world was confronted by a conspiracy, the contemplation of the results of the success of which he described "as a glimpse into Hell", and the success itself as "irrevocable tyranny".

So our job remains to keep sounding the alarm.

Mr. Harold Wilson's humiliating reception in Moscow is a pointer as to what to expect. Whatever he is in himself (and Mr. Ian Smith asked some pertinent questions on that score), he for present purposes is the exponent of social democracy; and social democracy is regarded by the Marxist theoreticians as the final stage in the 'inevitable' breakdown of the Capitalist system, leaving the proletariat no alternative but to accept Communist leadership. So the Russians evidently regard Mr. Wilson as a break-down product.

Well, the Capitalist system in Britain is breaking down all right; the financiers have seen to that. And the measures of the Wilson administration are plainly designed to bring production and the provision of services to a stand-still, producing mass privation and resentment, with 'democratic' leadership utterly discredited. That leaves the way open for a British People's Republic, whose natural ally would be the USSR, always willing to assist proletarian uprisings. Indeed, as Stalin wrote quite clearly (*Foundations of Leninism*), that is what the USSR is there for.

And, of course, with France covertly Communist, with NATO in process of dismantling, with Europe reduced to a position “to be taken over by telephone”, the fall of Britain could well be the detonator of the dynamite which has been laid everywhere. A ‘collapse’ of the dollar could be the end of the history of Christian civilisation.

(Sept. 10, 1966.)

* * *

Writing in the *Weekly Telegraph*, October 14, 1966, the Rt. Hon. Reginald Maudling says: “The basic long-term problem is to increase productivity. There is some danger that, by constantly repeating this theme, we may give our friends overseas an inadequate picture of the existing strength of British industry. The fact is that leading British firms are, in efficiency and technological advance, among the best in the world. *Only Germany exports a greater proportion of its national output.*”

The italics are ours, to emphasise the question which lies at the heart of the economic ‘problem’: if Britain exported the *whole* of its national output, would it thereby achieve one hundred percent efficiency? And, particularly in Britain’s case, it must be borne in mind that a large part of national output depends on the import of raw materials, so that unlimited exports would in the last resort mean unlimited imports.

Mr. Maudling is right, of course, about the existing strength of British industry. Modern industry had its beginning in Great Britain, and Great Britain began and sustained the industrialisation of the world. And ever since the industrial base has been expanding and improving in efficiency. In this context, efficiency may be defined as the ability to fulfil orders; if the orders are not forthcoming, the efficiency cannot be measured, but production falls off progressively as ‘redundancy’, properly called unemployment, or inability to place orders, plays its part in the vicious circle.

“Britain depends for prosperity on a flow of world trade as free and wide-spread as possible.” So if England sells a thousand cars to Germany, which sells a thousand cars to the U.S.A., which sells a thousand cars to Japan, which sells a thousand cars to England, you have prosperity? Because of the handling and freight charges? It was reported (A.B.C. News, Oct. 23, 1966) that for the first time Japan had imported more silk than she had exported. Then why export silk at all? Australia has a first-class textile industry, which is said to be threatened unless further export markets can be found; yet Australia is a net *importer* of textiles. Ordinarily intelligent children understand perfectly well that trade is barter; they call their own exchanges “swapping”, and if the exchange is unequal, the gainer is considered to be the one who gets the most for the least. But to economists, who appear to be unintelligent children, getting the most for the least is called an “unfavourable trade balance”. So ‘economic’ policy is to give (export) the most for the least (imports), and take the difference in ‘money’. But after the physical transaction is complete, the ‘money’ can only be spent on the balance of goods within the country. Why is it necessary to import ‘money’ to buy those goods?

Misunderstanding of these matters, if it *is* misunderstanding, is already responsible for an unprecedented rate of business failures in Britain; and with the failures, inevitably the suicide rate will go up. Since the ‘recession’ this time is admittedly an act of policy, the suicides will amount to murders.

(Nov. 19, 1966.)

* * *

President Banda of Malawi is evidently an economic and political realist. But his remark that he “refuses to be a hypocrite to gain cheap popularity” marks him as something more and better: responsible.

(Nov. 19, 1966.)

The vocabulary and the language of contemporary ‘economics’ ought to be sufficient to expose the fraudulent practices under which the British are suffering. “Squeeze”, “freeze”, “redeploy”, “reflate”, “export-led recovery”, “Gnomes of Zurich”, “credibility gap”, “emergency package”, “downturn”, “biting”, “the tide is right, the time is right, the winds are right” (H. Wilson), “industry . . . strengthened, streamlined, leaner and fitter to meet the challenges of the future” (H. Wilson). . . .

(Dec. 3, 1966.)

* * *

“But it is pointless now to job back in the paleography of what has become the Government’s usual doubletalk. The more important need is to try to decipher what exactly is the Government’s received doctrine at the moment.” (*The Economist*, October 29, 1966.)

And perhaps another important need is to find out from whom the Government receives its doctrine, and whether “orders” should not be substituted for “doctrine”. Later *The Economist* refers to “an entirely new economic policy, by which Labour must be judged when Part IV expires (and the shooting begins) next August 12th.” *Shooting?*

Further on *The Economist* refers to Mr. Stewart acting “so foolishly”, but later says “he feels he can move in this field without the cataclysmic results in causing bankruptcies which might follow from compulsory price orders in some other industries”. *The Economist* is referring to Mr. Stewart’s having issued the first compulsory price order under Part IV to laundries and dry cleaning establishments, which it calls “a remarkably blatant piece of politicking”, and “a shabby political manoeuvre”. Altogether, a nice blend of the village-idiot and the malignant-cunning theories, with *The Economist* and the journals which disagree with it possessing the wisdom so sadly lacking in politicians; as: “unfortunately, in the economic team itself, one is reduced to such tiny compliments as to say that a junior minister like Mrs. Shirley Williams this week made rather a good (if slightly inaccurate) speech.”

(Dec. 3, 1966.)

* * *

The root of the economic problem is that an expanding industry eventually supplies individuals with the durable goods they want, so that demand slackens, and slackens still more if unemployment (unemployment) increases. The answer to this is said to be to export more; but the difficulty here is that the sophisticated production of modern industry has to look to markets which themselves have increasingly developed the ability to produce sophisticated durables. So you try to keep prices down (“competitive”) by “restricting home demand”, and this brings about frustration and bankruptcies and go-slow activities to try to retain employment when ‘redundancy’ threatens.

This is a situation which cannot be overcome by British entry into the Common Market, since it has its origins in accountancy and not in lack of ‘productivity’. All industry everywhere has more or less steadily grown in productivity to a point where its capacity to dissipate the resources of the earth is approaching the magnitude of an international disaster, all in the name of “expanding international trade” —which fundamentally amounts to the swapping of motorcars, etc.

(Dec. 3, 1966.)

* * *

FROM THE XBC NEWS SERVICE: The Prime Minister said last night that his opponents should not underestimate the degree of his lack of unconcern at the upgrowth of the rate of under-redeployment. A degree of imbalance in some sectors was causing a shudder in the economic machine; it might be necessary to stop the ship of State while certain adjustments were effected. In particular the government had been giving urgent consideration for several months to the introduction of an unselective employment tax as a counter-weight to the selective employment tax which, while not ineffectively as intended, had caused some veering from the set course. After that it would be “go— full steam ahead”; or astern, if any submerged economic rocks threatened unforeseen disaster.

It was not made clear what degree of credibility-gap was applicable to the Prime Minister’s statement, but well-informed sources are confident that the remarks probably reflect to some degree what is in the Prime Minister’s mind, one way or the other.

(Dec. 17, 1966.)

* * *

In *The Monopoly of Credit* (1931) C. H. Douglas advised the fixing of responsibility for progressive disasters—at that time largely embodied in the tragedies of the Great Depression—on those in control of financial institutions. Progress in this strategy culminated in the election of a nominally Social Credit government in Alberta, but was halted by the outbreak of war. The pre-war manoeuvring, the course of the war itself, and post-war developments made it clear how wide-flung the conspiracy “to make the world safe for bankers, rather than [make] the world safe” actually is; and Douglas directed his efforts more and more to exposing the conscious intention underlying events, and to exposing those responsible.

Now just as the apparent impregnability of the position achieved by the conspirators was attained by the slow but persistent application of a conscious policy of centralisation, so a strategy of exposure must be persistent, for its effectiveness becomes apparent only as its effects become cumulative. Public opinion—the final sanction short of the police-state—is slow to form and slower to crystallise, particularly when it is misdirected by the agencies of the conspiracy on every possible occasion and issue. Yet truth *is* stronger than falsehood—*when the truth is known*. Fortunately the tools for making it known are now sufficiently available, and those willing and able to use them are increasing in numbers. It is only gradually that uncommon knowledge becomes common knowledge; but at some point of diffusion there will be a coalescence of individual knowledge into effective public opinion; and this is the essential objective to be worked for. We know by the sales of books and other materials that this process is going steadily forward, and it is essential that it be continued and accelerated.

(Dec. 17, 1966.)

FROM THE XBC FEATURE “WHAT THE LEADERS WRITE”: Referring to the Prime Minister’s declaration of economic intent, *The Speculator* comments “Too right!” The leader remarks on the Prime Minister’s come-to-be-expected polished sub-obscure, and suggests that the “shudder” in the economy is no more than a vibration, and attributes the Prime Minister’s “exaggeration” to the wails from the Tories at SET bites deeper. “Set fair,” the leader concludes.

The Encomium has nothing but praise for the Prime Minister’s perceptiveness and decision, but goes on to remark that of course the Prime Minister is obviously wrong to assess the danger to the ship of State as lying in unsuspected rocks; the real danger, very real danger, is of collision with the iceberg created by the government’s freeze. The remedy, which hits one in the eye but evades the P.M., is to de-freeze the iceberg. This would not only remove a possible region of collision, but could put into reverse the upgrowth in the rate of under-redeployment, on which the very possibility of the nation’s reaching its manifest destination, either ahead or astern, so patently depends. Think again, Mr. P.M.

The Chimes says that it is apparent that the Prime Minister is undecided as to whether the shaking of the economy which he so clearly perceives is due to a fault in the crankshaft or to unbalanced pistons. He is wise, therefore, to allow himself room for manoeuvre in the obviously dangerous and rock-infested waters in which the ship of State is now proceeding. But to refer to our uncertain course as a veer, when it is in fact a lurch, is undeniably and unjustifiably over-optimistic.

The New Tribesman and Internationalist considers the Prime Minister’s diagnosis entirely unfounded. The shuddering in the ship of State is certainly not due to faulty engines, but to the incompetence of the helmsman. Being off course, the ship is suffering a buffeting from the huge waves blown up by the wind of change. Had Britain settled the rebellious Rhodesians for good and all she would now be in calm waters; and housing would have reached 750,000 per year.

The Laborer accuses the government of tinkering with a worn-out engine which was never any good in the first place. It calls for a new captain and crew with the determination to tear out the rattling monster and replace it with an atom engine suitable for navigating in the waters of peaceful coexistence.

Walter Wonder in *The Custodian* is sorry to observe that the Prime Minister has strayed into shallow national waters instead of heading for the horizons of deep international channels. Thus it is clear to those with a knowledge of navigation that the shudder in the British ship means no less than that Britain is already on the rocks.

(Dec. 17, 1966.)

* * *

Anyone familiar with the British government's treachery towards Rhodesia in the matter of the 1961 Constitution* will have no difficulty in recognising the same type of technique in the manoeuvring for mandatory sanctions. When Rhodesia was provoked into the Unilateral Declaration of Independence, it appears to have been the expectation of the British (if it is British) government that sanctions would lead to internal disorders, triggered, organised and led by revolutionaries trained by Russian and Chinese experts in adjacent territories ('nations') and waiting to infiltrate into Rhodesia. It is also likely that the 'British' government underestimated the Rhodesian Cabinet's grasp of economic reality.

*See *Rhodesia Accuses*; for short account, see p. 27.

Mr. Wilson's Tigerish activity on the Mediterranean was a manoeuvre to draw attention away from the fact that his real demand on the Rhodesians was that they should hand over to the British government control over the forces of law and order. That would allow a situation to develop where the British could let a situation develop which could only be dealt with by the immediate granting of majority rule. And that in due course would allow a situation to develop by which the gateway to the Republic of South Africa would be thrown open, for South Africa is the last territorial objective of the Conspiracy; the rest is politics.

(Dec. 17, 1966.)

* * *

It is a remarkable fact of our time that there has come into existence what might be called "the profession of Sovietology". This is a pseudo-science staffed by practitioners, some of them professors, who make their living by 'interpreting' Soviet Russian (and Communist Chinese) intentions. They quote each other and agree or disagree, and even by this have built up a massive 'literature'. But in the main their raw material is the slogans carefully devised in the Kremlin and elsewhere to keep our eyes off the ball.

Thirty-six years have passed since Dimitri Manuilsky, a one-time Russian delegate to the UN, spoke of "launching the most spectacular peace movement on record". The object of this was to be to "put the bourgeoisie to sleep", so that the final takeover of the entire world by the Communists would succeed through the element of surprise.

This "peace offensive" was launched by Khrushchev in 1956, but passed largely unnoticed because of the dramatic diversion provided by de-Stalinisation. The vital importance of Khrushchev's speech at the Twentieth Party Congress was that it inaugurated the *strategy* of "peaceful coexistence" as the means of achieving world-wide Communist dictatorship—an objective which clearly could not be gained by a conventional military confrontation.

Peaceful coexistence has given the Sovietologists endless material for speculation. But it also led to doubts among rank and file Party members as to the Kremlin's ultimate intentions, and in consequence there has been a great deal of Party literature explaining that peaceful coexistence is simply the final strategy of conquest, the outcome of which "will be the triumph of communism throughout the entire world".

The American Bar Association commissioned Richard V. Allen to make a comprehensive study of official Communist Party pronouncements on and explanations to Communists of the true strategic significance of peaceful coexistence. The cumulative research by Mr. Allen and his assistants involved the analysis of more than three thousand articles, books, and other documents of Communist origin.

The result is a book* which ought to be compulsory reading for all those engaged in the formulation of national policy. It contains one hundred and seventy-five quotations from Communist sources, and these put entirely outside the realm of speculation what Communist intentions are. The Communists mean business, and their business is to subjugate the population of the entire world to perpetual world government by a self-selected and self-perpetuating elite.

**Peace or Peaceful Coexistence?*: American Bar Association: 1155 East 60th St., Chicago, Illinois 60637.

In the light of these revelations, any co-operation with Communist Russia or Communist China or their satellites amounts to criminal negligence of the interests of non-Communist nations. Trade with the Communists is betrayal; and that is why Mr. Allen's book should be compulsory reading, so that it could not be said: "Lord forgive them; they know not what they do."

(Dec. 31, 1966.)

* * *

Forty years ago there was room for a good deal of speculation as to the cause of the world's troubles, which in those days were trivial compared with those that beset us now, and indeed it seemed that only obtuseness on the part of financiers and a moderate degree of idiocy among the politicians stood in the way of a simple financial adjustment which would put matters right. Gradually it became apparent that so far from this being the case, some powerful group was actively opposed to simple solutions, and the location and identification of that group became of increasing importance.

With the Second World War and its aftermath, speculation became superfluous. The existence of a vast Conspiracy, *containing* both International Communism and International Finance, became visible, and more and more individuals engaged in it identifiable. Its *modus operandi* is through inner control of a number of wide flung or more restricted organisations, most of which appear to have legitimate and even laudable objectives. Thus spread throughout the United States are a series of Foreign Policy Associations, which are supposed to give local public leaders and prominent citizens insight into and guidance concerning the conduct of foreign policy. But included in the membership of most if not all of these are one or more members of the Council on Foreign Relations, and it is these who insinuate the guidance.

The Council on Foreign Relations is a Washington affair, and is interlocked with the State Department, the great financial Foundations, the Federal Reserve Board, news media, and foreign counterparts such as the Royal Institute of International Affairs. Some of its members are merely predominantly resident in the U.S.A., but spend a good deal of their time visiting their opposite numbers in other countries, including the Kremlin, so that with reciprocal visits we can recognise the existence of an international core or directorate, standing in relation to the CFR as the latter does to the Foreign Policy Associations.

The most readily identifiable Conspirators (after all, Professor Arnold Toynbee boasted that "we" are engaged in conspiracy—*International Affairs*, Nov. 1931) are those who are common to several of the interlocking organisations—who are, in fact, the mechanisms of the interlock. These are too numerous to represent the core of the Conspiracy; and who constitute that core is the best-kept secret of the ages. But it is sufficient at this time to identify the general group within which that core lies. Nothing but division is achieved by speculation on the composition of the core at this time. What is required is to break the Conspiracy open, and then *see* what is inside. When that has been done, the individuals currently responsible for the cumulative catastrophes of our times can be dealt with.

(Feb. 11, 1967.)

* * *

It is six years since armed forces under the control of the U.N., and with the blessing of the U.S.A. and the U.S.S.R., brutally crushed Katanga, to end its secession from the Communist promoted chaos in the rest of what used to be the Belgian Congo. The world, never told very much of the savagery of that campaign, has been allowed to forget what little it knew; but we should not forget. The story is told in sufficient detail in Edward Griffin's *The Fearful Master*, a study of the origin, structure, composition and sinister activities of the U.N., a committee of which is studying methods of making war on the Republic of South Africa.

We should not forget, for the real reason for the war on Katanga has now emerged. The Congolese 'government' has nationalised the copper industry of Katanga. According to a report published in *The Guardian*, Jan. 30, 1967, an international consortium will be formed to continue the mining operations. "Soon after the Kinshasa announcement, it was reported that the consortium would consist of the American Newmount Mining Company and the French Penarroya Company, linked with the Rothschild group. A third participant would be the Belgian Banque Lambert, which also has a link with Rothschild."

And that, of course, is what anti-colonialism is really all about. As the late C. H. Douglas pointed out in 1944 (*The Brief For the Prosecution*) the policy of World Dominion, once pursued mainly through the control of money, gold, and credit, had reached the stage where legal control of raw materials had become essential to its pursuit to a final and successful conclusion. The Governments of Rhodesia and of the Republic of South Africa are not likely to nationalise their mineral wealth, and hand over legal control to international consortia—not, that is, until they enjoy ‘majority rule’. And, by gad, the U.N. will give it to them.

(Feb. 25, 1967.)

* * *

India, in so far as it became a political entity, was a British creation. Its history as such began on the last day of the sixteenth century, when Queen Elizabeth granted a charter to a London Company trading with the East Indies. From this flowed in due course the establishment by the British of a common administration for the great sub-continent, and the adoption of English as the common language of educated Indians, where previously the many races spoke about 200 languages. In these circumstances, British withdrawal was the death of India, reflected immediately by partition into “India” and “Pakistan” and conflict between these arbitrary units over Kashmir. The mystique of Ghandi and Nehru, and the stored momentum of British administration, delayed the disintegration of the corpse of the old India, but with the departure of the British spirit, the process of dust unto dust began, and now stands visible in the collapse of the Congress Party.

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

Douglas also wrote that while world dominion had not the slightest chance of ultimate success, it had every prospect of setting back civilisation by several centuries. And this is what it has done, with consequences in famines and crime gaining almost daily momentum. No wonder that Douglas considered that the apex of the conspiracy probably contacted Satanic forces. There is clearly worse to come. Civilisation is a slow and uncertain *growth* arising in the first place from a homogeneous culture but able, when sufficiently developed, to absorb non-homogeneous cultures. But growth, which takes place from a centre like the germinal point of an egg or a seed, cannot be replaced by international planning or external programmes of aid which indeed are lethal to organic growth.

All that could save the peoples of the continents from further immolation to the point of virtual destruction would be their re-colonisation from a secure economic and cultural base—an impossibility unless and until the Conspiracy underlying the destruction of religious civilisation—that is to say, civilisation having its foundations in metaphysical reality—is itself destroyed.

(March 11, 1967.)

* * *

Insanity is the condition where the mind has lost touch with reality. Contemporary insanity, now very widespread, is largely the result of the brain-washing which goes under the name of education, but because it is so common, is not recognised for what it is. Belief in socialism is completely pathological, because socialism is contrary to human nature and behaviour, and requiring, by definition, the subordination of individuality, has to be enforced by the few on the many.

It is ‘education’ which has enabled the monstrous imposition of socialism, and at his investiture as Rector of Edinburgh University, Mr. Malcolm Muggeridge said of education that it “had become a sort of mumbo-jumbo or cure-all for the ills of a godless and decomposing society. . . . Whether it was juvenile delinquency, high school pregnancies, or drug-addiction among Brownies, he said, the solution was always the same—more education.” (*Times*, Feb. 17, 1967)

Mr. Muggeridge is further quoted as saying: “There is no doubt that we shall go on raising the school

age, multiplying and enlarging our universities, increasing public expenditure on education until juvenile delinquency, beats and drug addicts and general intimations of illiteracy multiply so alarmingly that, at last, the whole process is called in question.”

A few sane and cultivated men and women do call the process in question; but the majority of leaders, many of them unrecognised paranoiacs, bent on imposing uniformity and technology on the masses, are accelerating the process which can only end in our destruction—as planned.

(March 11, 1967.)

* * *

“The message of the *Protocols* is simple. It is that the Jews are not (as earlier anti-Semites had maintained) merely a verminous race of jugglers and magicians, whom God, for their crime in crucifying His Son, has condemned to wander as strangers in the world, disorganised, homeless and persecuted. On the contrary, they are a diabolical community held together in an invisible polity and aiming, under the secret, Machiavellian central direction of their ‘Elders’, at the systematic penetration and ultimate domination of the Christian world.”

Thus Professor Hugh Trevor-Roper, Regius Professor of Modern History at Oxford, in an article published in *Spectator* of Feb. 17, 1967. He is referring to *The Protocols of the Elders of Zion*.

This remarkable document is not in itself a “message”. It is a carefully set forth and extraordinarily coherent *plan* for the conduct of a very long-term policy. In the form in which this plan was published by Sergei Nilus, in Russia in 1905, it appears that this is a Jewish plan, and thus could be, as Professor Trevor-Roper says it was, used at a basis of anti-Semitism—and also as a basis of discrediting any conspiratorial theory of history.

But the specific references to Jews can be left out of the text, and the plan still remains. If the events even of this century are considered in the light of that plan, they can be seen to be the virtually exact fulfilment of what in the *Protocols* are only projected intentions; and the existence of those intentions are the only credible explanation of the terrible condition in which contemporary society finds itself. The only alternative explanation—that these events have come about of their own accord and despite the best efforts of intellectuals and statesmen to prevent them—carries the implication that men cannot control events. But this carries the further implication that mankind’s ultimate—and not too ultimate at that—future is completely hopeless. If we have a hope, it is that the plan delineated in the *Protocols* and elsewhere is in fact operative, because we might be able to deal with the plan, and, more importantly, the operators, whoever they may prove to be.

The *Protocols* are usually denounced as a forgery—a denunciation which to be valid would imply the existence of some genuine document which had been counterfeited. And in fact, there are genuine documents relating to conspiracy, much of the contents of which are to be found in the *Protocols*. These are documents seized by the Bavarian authorities in 1786 in a raid on the house of a suspected conspirator, and subsequently published under the title *Original Writings of the Order of the Illuminati**. So the *Protocols* may have been fabricated after a study of these, and similar, authentic documents. Nevertheless, the internal evidence of the *Protocols* is of a continuous and highly coherent plan brought up to date: what in some instances is projected in the *Original Writings* is taken as having been accomplished in the *Protocols* about a century later.

*For some details and references, see *Antecedents of Communism*: Tidal Publications, Sydney.

Presumably Professor Trevor-Roper would accept that the manifest activities of the Communist Parties throughout the world are related to the writings of Marx, Engels, Lenin and Stalin. These writings too embody material to be found in the *Original Writings*; but it would be difficult to substantiate a charge that the present state of the world owes nothing to the activities of the Communist Parties as coordinated from Moscow. The *Original Writings*, and the *Protocols*, point to a beyond to those activities, one of which is the promotion of all forms of class and race hatred.

(March 11, 1967.)

* * *

One of the main characteristics of an Age of Materialism is its apparent lack of a unifying principle, and this is probably the main reason for the prevalence—almost the universality—of the episodic view of history. The episodic view—not only of history, but of life—is that everything happens from day to day, a sort of “I wonder what will happen today?” outlook. It is as if night had the power to cancel the consequences of the day.

If, as we believe, history is crystallised policy, it must be remembered that that policy is the application of a philosophy. History, and in so far a given civilisation or culture, is the concrete expression of philosophy. “In the beginning was the Word”. “Society is primarily metaphysical.” If these statements are true—and the Social Credit position rests on the assumption that they are—then even a Materialistic Age has a metaphysical basis. That is to say, day to day events and appearances are the outcome of a continuous policy, which in turn derives from a definite belief. So far as the masses are concerned, this belief may be that there is nothing to believe in, apart from the ‘good’ of employment and amusement.

But there is much evidence that this ‘belief’ of the masses is the outcome of a policy designed to inculcate it—a policy of attack against indigenous culture, carried on by subversive propaganda (not Communist only), and by cross-breeding. To paraphrase Professor Toynbee, the industrial revolution is being *used* to break up indigenous cultures, and create large cosmopolitan cities whose populations are being recruited from all corners of the earth.

Behind this policy again there must be the philosophy from which it derives. Just as the centuries of greatness of the British Isles, and Europe, for example, were the outcome of a belief, issuing in policy, in a Trinitarian God; or in the case of China, in a belief, again issuing in policy, in the Tao—so the Welfare State is the outcome of the belief, issuing in policy, in the mission of a Chosen People to rule One World.

This belief, and its derived policy (which, of course, has varied in its adaptation to circumstances) has had a beginning in time; but now we are faced with a tremendous acceleration in its spread—thanks largely, as Professor Toynbee points out, to the industrial revolution and the annihilation of distance, to which we may add the virtual simultaneity of modern communications.

It is this acceleration that constitutes the Social Credit problem. It is this that makes the episodic view, particularly of contemporary events, appear appropriate. Events appear now to happen ‘by themselves’, so that their derivation from a steadily applied policy is so much harder to grasp.

The reason for this acceleration is the progressive replacement of one philosophy, or system of belief, by another. A homogeneous culture can naturally be displaced only slowly at first, but as this displacement and replacement proceed, a point comes when the advantage lies with the replacing philosophy. And that is where we are now.

The situation is like a set of scales, with Social Credit on one side, and the Welfare State on the other; as one side rises the other falls. It is not a question of a system, but of an *outlook*. Social Credit is the policy of a philosophy; at present the wrong philosophy is in the ascendant, so that, *in this sense*, Social Credit policy is inapplicable, and, *a fortiori*, so is Social Credit technique. The latter, however, is quite applicable in the sense that at least an arithmetically correct financial system is a prerequisite to recovery *when we are in a position to recover*. Thus the correct application of Social Credit policy at present is to reduce the ascendancy of the opposing philosophy. Now there are signs of opposition to this philosophy on many fronts, as the fruits of the tree become apparent. But it is no use our hanging figs on the thorn bush; it has to be rooted out; then we shall see what condition the fig-tree is in.

(Reprinted March 25, 1966; originally published March 3, 1956.)

* * *

It will come as a surprise to most of our readers to learn that the U.S.A. is now a net *importer* of agricultural products. This was disclosed in the June 20, 1966 issue of the *Dan Smoot Report*, and has been elaborated by Dan P. Van Gorder in a book *Ill Fares the Land**. Dan Smoot’s report was entitled *Planned*

Famine, and Van Gorder shows that this is indeed the case. With the inauguration of the New Deal, the Agricultural Adjustment Act was implemented, with the objective of cutting back America's agricultural capacity, under cover, of course, of raising prices for the farmers. Continuously since then, agricultural output *per head of population* has fallen, until now the U.S.A. depends on imports to maintain its food supplies. Parallel with this has been an equally steady decline in the farm population—a process irreversible except over a long period of time, and in a political climate very different from that of the 'Great' Society.

*Western Islands, Belmont, Massachusetts 02178.

Van Gorder's book is based on statistics issued by the Department of Agriculture—statistics which he reproduces as tables and graphs. He shows that there are no surpluses. "For the whole agricultural overproduction theme song to us since 1933 is a hoax. It is a plain and simple unmitigated lie. It is a lie told to hide the work of men who have set up the conditions for famine.

"The overproduction hoax was originated, not to help the farmer, but to weld the chains of slavery on him as the initial step in the socialization of the entire American economy.

"It was devised, not by loyal defenders of constitutional government, but by a small group dominated by trained agents of Communist infiltration . . . the infamous 'Ware cell'."

Thus the conditions have been brought about where a crisis, international or national, could precipitate an actual famine and the introduction of ration cards—the ultimate weapon in the hands of militant revolutionaries.

We have frequently predicted that the culmination of the Conspiracy which already engulfs us would appear as an 'accident'; and here we see its planned mechanics. The *evidence* of Conspiracy is overwhelming, and can be studied in the books listed in our list of recommended reading. A Conspiracy extending so far back, of such magnitude, and now visibly approaching culmination, is not going to recoil from the use of famine and terror to make its dominion, as it thinks, perpetual. But until that time comes, as Manuilski said, "the bourgeoisie must be put to sleep".

(April 8, 1967.)

* * *

As Rostow, Chairman Ashley & Co. and American businessmen champion East-West trade, some historians are recalling an old Lenin quote found in the archives. Recently reprinted by the authoritative *Bulletin* of the Institute for the Study of the USSR, it says:

"On the basis of observations gathered during my years of exile, the 'cultured' class of the capitalist countries of Western Europe and America; i.e., the ruling classes, the financial aristocracy, the bourgeoisie and the idealistic democrats should be regarded as deaf-mutes and treated accordingly. . . .

"The deaf-mute capitalist hoarders, their governments, the Chambers of Commerce, the federations of industry, bank groups, steel kings, rubber kings, aluminium kings and others will close their eyes to the above-mentioned truth and so become blind, deaf and dumb. They will grant us credits, which will fill the coffers of the Communist organizations in their countries while they enlarge and improve our armaments industry by supplying all kinds of wares, which we shall need for future and successful attacks against our suppliers. . . .

—*Human Events*, March 11, 1967.

(April 8, 1967.)

* * *

Although the British Prime Minister has, with evident relish, personally identified himself with the onslaught on Rhodesia, his briefings, like those of his predecessors, have come from the Commonwealth Relations Office. Unfortunately, there are in Britain no investigating committees like those of the U.S. Congress, able to call witnesses and take evidence on oath. Although in the U.S. the Congressional Committees have now largely been muzzled by Executive Orders, they were formerly able to establish con-

clusively the deep penetration of government by identified Communist agents, and to demonstrate the *modus operandi* of such penetration. The Commonwealth Relations Office (like the Cabinet Office) is an obvious target for Communist penetration, and the war on Rhodesia bears all the marks of a Communist operation. Mr. Wilson's flamboyance distracts attention from the long continuity of the provocations which led to the Unilateral Declaration of Independence.

Mr. Kenneth Young has narrated* the background and events leading up to and flowing from UDI. "The narration is based on printed sources and on primary research into unpublished documents and private statements made to me by some of the leading participants in Britain and Rhodesia." Mr. Young does not suggest or imply that British actions have been Communist-inspired; but his account is full enough that anyone familiar with Communist objectives and techniques can see the links with the International Conspiracy. Harold Soref's *The Puppeteers* lists and describes the many interlocking organisations and fronts which have concerned themselves with Rhodesia, and this book, read in conjunction with Mr. Young's narrative, makes it plain enough where the master-minding comes from.

**Rhodesia and Independence*: London: Eyre and Spottiswoode. Pp. 562 plus index.

Rhodesia and Independence, while it includes a full account of the confrontation aboard *H.M.S. Tiger*, ends before the UN imposition of mandatory sanctions, and therefore does not include an account of how the Rhodesian Government's requests by telegram and letter to the UN Secretary-General requesting that Rhodesia's case should be heard by the Security Council were 'misaid'; but it does include as an Appendix a full account of Rhodesia's attempt in May 1966 to be heard on the question of blockading Beira.

It is becoming more apparent almost daily that the fate of this civilisation may well hinge on the success or failure of the attempt to subjugate Southern Africa. For one thing, successful subjugation is evidently vital to the Conspiracy's ultimate victory; for another, the courageous resistance of Rhodesia is forcing the Conspiracy—or the workings of the Conspiracy—more and more into the open. The failure of the initial British onslaught on Rhodesia is probably the first real set-back to the Conspiracy since 1923; and it is, correspondingly, the greatest opportunity yet offered to the opponents of the occult forces working for World Government. What is required now is sufficient pressure on Members of Parliament to have Rhodesian independence recognised. Even the threat of such pressure is likely to force the Conspiracy more and more into the open. And when the Conspiracy is sufficiently visible, it will be destroyed, just as when a community recognises the presence of a rogue animal, it unites to eliminate the danger. Or as Douglas put it (*Programme for the Third World War*), the combination of A with B for the elimination of C. If a new slogan is needed, let it be: "Victims of the Conspiracy, unite."

"The obstacles to understanding are formidable: not least the power of the mass media. To the present writer at least it has been a frightening experience to find friends of intelligence and integrity, who have never been to Rhodesia, stating as categorical facts propositions anyone who lives here knows to be untrue—and answering objections by asserting that Rhodesians are brainwashed! Surely this is the stuff of war.

"One was compelled to admit, after a recent visit to Britain, that the image of Rhodesia put across by the mass media is overpowering in its conviction and well-nigh irresistible. Returning to Salisbury one had to rub one's eyes to realise that this smiling, tranquil land is the same country as the nightmare tyranny endlessly placarded, denounced and pilloried in Britain."

—Fr. A. R. Lewis, Archdeacon of Inyanda, Rhodesia, in *Church Times*, April 21, 1967.

Doubtless the Commu-Socialists would regard the mass media as organs of 'Capitalist' oppression, and the Government of Rhodesia as a similar instrument. Unfortunately this sort of incongruity presents no sort of problem to the 'liberal' mentality. Yet when the terror descends on Britain, the 'liberals' will be among its first victims, for they are the bourgeoisie, to be exterminated as a class.

(May 20, 1967.)

* * *

Long before ballistic missiles and atomic bombs were thought of, the late C. H. Douglas defined the

objective of internationalist global strategy as being to gain control of the last squadron of bombers. That objective has emerged ever more clearly through the confusions of the past fifty years, requiring the artificial antics at the United Nations to obscure the final moves in its achievement.

The present 'crisis' in the Middle East has its roots beyond the First World War, but a clear line can be seen from the setting up of the Federal Reserve banking system in the U.S.A., which effectively centralised control of credit and thus of American policy, especially foreign policy. This control was used to exact the Balfour Declaration, favouring a national home for Jews in Palestine, as the price of America's entering the war on the Allies' side, and after the war to negotiate the Versailles Treaty to ensure a resumption of war at a suitable time. This resumed war provided, amongst other advantages to the conspirators, the opportunity to pour Jewish 'refugees' into the national 'home'. Terrorism plus international chicanery enabled the establishment of the State of Israel, recognised and supported by both Moscow and Washington.

Bearing in mind that Israelis just as much as Arabs are cannon-fodder, and that nations and countries are pawns in the deadly struggle to impose a world-police force on the whole of what is left of mankind; that the "last squadron of bombers" is in the U.S.A., but potentially under the control of the American *people*, it is not difficult to see that the control of the Middle East by 'Russia' (it could hardly be controlled *directly* by 'America') would (or will) complete the outflanking of America, thus producing a situation where surrender to a Russian ultimatum would appear to the American *people* logical and inevitable. Checkmate.

You think it has not been planned that way? Of course you do. A vast effort and expense has been undertaken to control the way you think. We are confronted with murder, presented with the appearance of accident, and everything depends on our taking the appearance for the reality.

(July 1, 1967.)

* * *

"Making all due allowances for the defects in it which are only too obvious, the Anglo-Saxon character probably remains the greatest bulwark against tyranny that exists in the world today. That is a thesis on which a large number of volumes have been written, and it does not seem necessary to expand it further. But if it be granted, it will be agreed that any attempt, either conscious or unconscious, to establish an effective hegemony over the whole of the world would be likely to concentrate on such methods as would paralyse the Anglo-Saxon." (C. H. Douglas, *Social Credit*, 1924.)

We know now beyond peradventure that there *is* a *conscious* attempt to establish an effective hegemony over the whole of the world. Until the outbreak of war in 1914, the world was largely under the influence of the Pax Britannica, which was essentially the diffusion of the Anglo-Saxon character and its derivative institutions. Nauseatingly much has been heard of "gun-boat diplomacy", just as the cry is being raised in the U.S.A. of "police brutality". But the fruits of "gun-boat diplomacy" which, in a world assimilating the potentially devastating effects of the industrial revolution, was akin to maintaining order in the kindergarten, were in the main benevolent. "India" is a British creation, unified, so far as it has remained unified, by the English language and British institutions. Canada and Australia have become nations in their own right; the Republic of South Africa has English as a main language, and the British type of Parliamentary Democracy; Southern Rhodesia was independent in all but name until the "dismantling" of the British Empire began in earnest. The United States of America until it became the headquarters of the Money Power was predominantly Anglo-Saxon in character. All this means that within the framework of the Pax Britannica the Anglo-Saxon character expressed itself in increasing self-determination, culminating in one way or another in "independence", which is simply the formal recognition of self-determination, just as a child gains legal independence on the attainment of its majority.

The present world disorder is most easily understood as the outcome of the steps taken by the Money Power to paralyse the Anglo-Saxon, and subvert his institutions. The first step to world hegemony is destruction of the existing order, and this has been accomplished on the do-it-yourself principle of granting independence to undeveloped areas, and providing arms to the natives to slaughter each other and disrupt the communications and services on which growth through nurture could eventually lead to genuine self-determination and independent nationhood.

The purpose of destruction is largely accomplished. “Gunboat diplomacy” is no longer possible except to the U.S.A., the headquarters of the Money Power, and co-agent with the U.S.S.R. of the International Conspiracy to attain world hegemony.

In the article *Social Credit and Suez* (T.S.C., June 17, 1967) we reviewed briefly the concept of the Heartland, now in the control of the Conspiracy. But the communications centre of the world, controlling the distribution of the world’s natural resources, is the Middle East. Arabs as nationals, and except as slaves, are therefore marked out for destruction, which is why they are being armed, but only vocally if vociferously supported, by the U.S.S.R. Anyone who will give due consideration to the linked events of the past 50 years should be able to recognise in the present situation in the Middle East the fruition of the strategy embodied in the Balfour Declaration. Any more sentimental view is closing one’s eyes to disaster.

(July 29, 1967.)

* * *

And yet, it is not too late, or may not be. If by any means the Anglo-Saxon character can be resuscitated, Anglo-Saxon institutions survive and could be revived. The first requirement would be to get Socialists, whether Fabian or Communist, out of administrations, and then to form an economically self-contained Anglo Saxon Common Market based on a realistically reformed monetary system. It should always be borne in mind that *it is not necessary to import money to buy your own goods*. The “dollar shortage” (or sterling crisis) is a myth, though admittedly supported by sanctions. But myths are susceptible to exposure, like the myth of the Emperor’s clothes; and it is more than doubtful whether physical sanctions would be employed—yet—against a determined and realistic discarding of the myth. The value of “sterling”—of any monetary unit—resides in its generalised purchasing power, which rests on productive capacity and realistic accounting. Productive capacity in its turn rests on access to raw materials, all of which, for example, are to be found within Canada, Australia and Britain, for a start.

However, if it is not too late, time is running out very fast. Strong indications have been published that severe crises involving Korea, East Germany and Cuba have been planned for later this year; these, added to Vietnam and the Middle East, might well present the U.S.A. with an ‘impossible’ situation, in which surrender to external authority would appear inevitable.

(July 29, 1967.)

* * *

“The Administration seems unaware that one of the Soviet objectives is to strangle the great arteries of maritime communication, one by one. Russia’s Egyptian cat’s-paw Nasser, has closed the Suez Canal with sunken ships and attempted to blockade the Gulf of Aqaba. The United States has fallen for Communist and Afro-Asian propaganda and got itself into a senseless quarrel with South Africa, whose ports and refueling depots are vital to use in the substitute route around the tip of southern Africa. Now the United States position in the Panama Canal has been compromised.

“The stage is set for Communist strangulation of the great sea arteries which contribute so much to American strategic mobility.”

—*Human Events*, July 8, 1967.

The operative word here is “seems”. It has never been our contention that the Administration in the U.S.A. is run by people who are unaware of what is going on. They are not fools, though they employ and direct both fools and knaves. The hard fact is that virtually openly since 1942 U.S.A. policy has furthered Communist objectives. And the U.S. position in the Panama Canal has not been compromised, but surrendered. But the Administration does not consider this an appropriate time to announce the fact. Maybe the time will be when the other anticipated crises blow up.

And don’t forget that Cuba is a missile and aircraft arsenal aimed at the U.S.A., just to convince the American public that it has run out of options.

(July 29, 1967.)

* * *

Like the surviving victims of bush-fires, floods, hurricanes or earthquakes, the inhabitants of Detroit, Newark and other areas of rioting and vandalism, arson and looting in the U.S.A. must be wondering why it should happen to *them*. They should not wonder. Negro revolution as a tactic of Communism was laid down in the Sixth World Congress of the Communist Party in 1928, and the training of its organisers begun. Before this year's disasters began, cities were named where riots would be provoked. A detailed and highly documented account of the origin, development, and place in total Communist strategy of race riots for the takeover of the U.S.A. is contained in *It's Very Simple* by Alan Stang. As this book is readily available in an inexpensive edition, it is unnecessary here to detail the techniques and provocations of disorder. What is more important is their purpose.

The Government of the U.S.A. is estimated in *American Opinion* Scoreboard for 1967 as being 60-80% Communist controlled—and here, of course, “Communist” refers to the total International Conspiracy for World Government, and not only to that segment of it which is represented by the Open Communist Party. Now the line we are being fed by that Government, and by Press and radio, is that the plight of the Negroes is the fault of the Whites, and that this plight must be rectified immediately by a strengthened Federal Government. U.S. citizens are being imbued with a collective sense of guilt, so that they will feel that they deserve the police-state which is visibly drawing closer. It is perfectly evident that President Johnson's Commission to study the origin of the riots is intended simply to increase Negro discontent, divert attention from the Communist organisation of the riots, and increase the sense of guilt and give the Government still more power over people.

If one looks beyond the brain-washing propaganda which the riots have unleashed, as they were designed to do, to the underlying realities of the situation, it is quite clear that the ‘problems’ of the Negroes are insoluble except over a relatively long period of time. Uneducated adults have become uneducable; bad living habits of laziness and irresponsibility have become ingrained; slums—some having become so through the habits of the inhabitants—cannot be replaced except in years; and with the progress of automation, employment is becoming ever more sophisticated. All this is to say that the problem is dynamic, not static; it is the dog chasing its tail. On this basis, it is clear that with the best of goodwill and the most enlightened of policies, the problem is one extending over a minimum of a generation, probably of two—say, something like fifty years. And every riot, with its physical destruction, adds further years to the problem.

It is not possible exactly to estimate the time-table of disaster, but it appears certain at this juncture that the point of no return lies well within fifty years, and with a high degree of probability, within the next five. But what does appear to be certain is that the position of this indeterminate point will largely be determined by the handling of the Negro ‘problem’. If it is aggravated, we are doomed; if it can be resolved in terms of economic and political realism, hope remains. For all too obviously now, the fate of the world depends on events within the U.S.A.

(Aug. 12, 1967.)

* * *

“There is a series of interconnections among those who are now in charge of Svetlana's affairs which, in the absence of ‘politics’, it may be useful to travel. The firm of Greenbaum, Wolff & Ernst represented Harper & Row in the struggle with Mrs. Kennedy over *The Death of a President*. Harper & Row will soon publish the confessions of Marina Oswald. Marina Oswald's co-author is Priscilla Johnson MacMillan, Svetlana's translator and hostess. Priscilla Johnson MacMillan interviewed Svetlana in 1956 in Russia. She interviewed Lee Harvey Oswald in 1959 in Russia. Her translation of Svetlana's memoirs will be edited at Harper's by Evan Thomas, who edited the Manchester book and who, we note in passing, is the son of Norman Thomas. The least that might be deduced from this extraordinarily compact bunch of associations is that the raw material of these twin convulsive episodes in Soviet-American affairs has somehow managed to find itself a singularly narrow outlet. Or to put the matter more dramatically, when the stage management is this careful, it is likely that there is something more to the act.”

—*Regina Notes* (Dublin), July, 1967.
(Aug. 12, 1967.)

* * *

“It now is definitely established by authoritative sources,” said U.S. News and World Report last week, “that a major Soviet blunder led to the *Arab-Israeli war* early in June. The Soviet government, to further its purposes, faked intelligence reports to the governments of Egypt and Syria—that Israel was massing troops to attack Syria.”

—*Human Events*, July 22, 1967.

Blunder? *American Opinion Scoreboard 1967* assesses Israel as being 70-80% Communist controlled—again, in the sense of the global Conspiracy. The Israelis are a highly integrated community (not in the sense that Arabs hold any positions of importance in that community), whereas the Arabs are not. It is impossible to imagine the Arab states as playing any critical role in a scheme for World Government, of which, geographically, the Middle East is the strategic centre. But it is far from impossible to imagine Israel in such a role.

The outcome of the Israel-‘Arab’ ‘war’ furthered Communist objectives through an operation as neatly devised and cunningly camouflaged through all the usual channels of propaganda as history has ever recorded.

(Aug. 12, 1967.)

* * *

“Sen. Gordon Allott (R.-Colo.) noted recently that interest on the *national debt* will increase to \$14.2 billion in the coming fiscal year. This, he points out, is more than the combined total spent by the Departments of State, Labor, Commerce, Agriculture, Interior and Justice, plus the Atomic Energy Commission and the District of Columbia government. It is also more than the entire federal budget as recently as 1941.”

—*Human Events*, July, 1967.

(Aug. 12, 1967.)

* * *

The global Communist Conspiracy has many components. The components consist of chains of related events, such as Balfour to Middle East 1967; the Negro ‘problem’ 1924- 1967; anti-colonialism 1942-1967; increasing cartelisation; USSR’s alleged growing nuclear supremacy; the growth of astronomical debt; increasing economic difficulties in a world of increasing abundance. If these chains of events are drawn as lines on a sheet of paper, they will be seen as converging to a point—the point of no return, where the process of the destruction of Christian Western civilisation can no longer be checked, let alone reversed. The indications are that we are perilously close—NATO dismantled in all but name, de Gaulle pronouncing Communist objectives in Quebec, the Heartland in the control of the Communists, the strategic centre of the Middle East seized, disorder in Hong Kong, the *announcement* of British withdrawal “East of Suez”, the no-win war in Vietnam (*why* did General Taylor fly to Australia?), the culminating riots and crime in the U.S.A., Cuba, under U.S.A. protection, an underground arsenal with weapons aimed at the U.S.A. (where else would they be aimed?), Soviet build-up of war capacity in ‘East’ Germany, increasing activity by North Korea, a mounting threat to Morocco, chaos in Africa, sanctions against Rhodesia, the (planned) failure of British economic measures—it all adds up to something too much for the U.S.A. (“the guardian of world peace”) to handle, or so we are supposed to believe.

Nobody outside the inner Conspiracy knows how much time is left; but the one thing left to us is to utilise whatever time there is to exposing the Conspiracy, its aims, and its techniques. Quite sufficient ammunition for this war of exposure is now available. Aim high, and shoot fast.

(Aug. 12, 1967.)

* * *

One of the more nauseating features of contemporary journalism is the way in which a select group of editorialists and commentators—represented in Britain, for example, by the group of papers whose views are

put forward by the BBC Overseas Service under the title “What the British Weeklies Say”—make their living by trading in words and phrases, with varying degrees of verbal dexterity, snideness and cynicism, supplied by the propaganda department of the Conspiracy.

The Negro “problem” in the U.S.A. is almost universally discussed in terms of *ghetto, slums, rats, under-privilege, poverty, years of oppression, equal rights, lack of educational opportunity, deprivation, discrimination, segregation*. There are no doubt other terms, but any hack journalist who knows what is expected of him can make do with a selection of these.

Ghetto, specifically, is the Jews’ quarter in a town. In many cases Jews made their own ghettos, because, as an exclusive people with exclusive customs, they preferred their own company. In other cases Jews were either forced into a given area, or confined by law to the ghetto.

Whites as well as Negroes live in slums, which in essence are the outward manifestation of the disposition of the inhabitants; a man is not what he is because he lives in a slum; he remains in a slum because of what he is. And the rats swarm in because he throws his garbage out into the street. If the people of a neighbourhood got together to organise their own garbage disposal, the rats would go.

When the Irish began emigrating to Boston, the conditions which met them were described by the Committee of Internal Health in 1849 as follows: “This whole district is a perfect hive of human beings, without comforts and mostly without common necessities; in many cases huddled together like brutes. . . .” (Quoted by Ralph de Toledano, *R.F.K., The Man Who Would Be President*.) But de Toledano comments “. . . the Irish could piece together the remnants of their own culture and look ahead with hope to a day when life would give them more than their daily bread, their drink of whisky, and the blandishments of the corner saloon. . . .

“The times were propitious. Industry, numbers, and a natural genius for politics were giving the Irish in Boston and New York the kind of power which in a few decades would place in their hands the control of the big-city machines and open the doors to advancement and eminence in every field of American life.” Thus the second generation Kennedy became a multi-millionaire, and the third—President of the U.S.A.

The Irish have done better than the Negroes; but the Negroes *who have wanted to* have done very well indeed. They have risen in business and the professions, and acquired good homes, cars, and the other modern amenities. According to George Schuyler, a Negro writer (*Human Events*, Aug. 12, 1967), there are at present 320,000 Negro students matriculating in the nation’s colleges and universities; and there are more than 2.5 million Negro-owned automotive vehicles.

It is difficult to believe that facts such as these are unknown to the select band of commentators and ‘reporters’ who are brainwashing the world into the belief that Negro riots are the outcome of white oppression. Some of the commentators no doubt are secret Marxists, working for world revolution and a New Order. But others simply know what is expected of them.

And now Dr. Martin Luther King, also a Marxist, is calling for a campaign of civil disobedience, which he considers will hurt the white power structure even more than do the riots. If this ‘non-violent’ campaign comes off, look out. There *is* an attempt being made to start civil war in the U.S.A. If it does not come off, it probably cannot be attempted a second time, because its raw material will have become disillusioned, and the truth behind the attempt is becoming more widely known even daily. We appear to have entered the “now or never” stage of the Conspiracy, and the odds are not yet in our favour.

(Sept. 9, 1967.)

* * *

Probably relatively few people have ever seen a termite. But equally, most people who have been in the countryside have seen the amorphous mounds which are the evidence of termite activity.

Imagine a well-designed and constructed, and for good measure, even beautiful timber home. It is attacked by termites. Gradually it will crumble and disappear, to become another amorphous mound. But

within that mound the highly complex social life of the termite goes on—a life of high organisation and full employment.

This is, fairly exactly, what is happening to what we variously call Christian Western civilisation. Its structure is crumbling in the decay of religious, moral and ethical standards. In a world of ever-increasing plenty, the crime rate is increasing several times faster than the population rate; drug addiction is rampant and even finds its public defenders, as does sexual depravity; ‘sex’ is blatantly commercialised and degraded—look at almost any display of paper-backs; the clergy incite and participate in riots, and lend the support of their office to the propaganda aims of the Conspiracy.

Within this crumbling mound the termites—the Conspirators—are constructing the New Order of computerised technology, in which more and more people are becoming redundant and something less than persons, but none-the-less enslaved. The literally terrifying state of contemporary society in the U.S.A. in particular is well described in the first of Paul Goodman’s Massey Lectures, in which he shows modern technology as completely out of hand, and with the solutions for the problems raised as simply compounding the problems. For example, the small farmer has been driven off the land; but he cannot be absorbed into modern sophisticated technological employment. It would have been better and cheaper to have left him on the land, thus at least not further aggravating the already almost insuperable problems of over-urbanisation—air and water pollution, traffic congestion, slums, crime and violence.

As Lord Acton observed of the French Revolution, behind the tumult lies the design. Indeed, the current world revolution is the lineal descendant and culmination of the French Revolution, and at its core are the lineal descendants of earlier generations of Conspirators. Social Credit could have saved the world in 1918; but only stark recognition of the truth, and dealing with the Conspirators, can save it now.

(Sept. 9, 1967.)

* * *

Barbarism is a condition of life characterised by primitive standards and methods of living, superstition, and absence of moral and spiritual ideas. What we call civilisation is the emergence from this condition, and the in-building into society of the ideas and institutions of moral order and spiritual values.

In this conception, progress consists in the incarnation in customs, behaviour and institutions of Reality ever more profoundly understood: true progress is moral progress, of which the outward manifestation is Art. In all this, science is no more than a tool for the exploration of Reality; and while technology may display art, it too is a tool.

Yet science and technology have become ends in themselves, and increasingly the very idea of progress becomes identified with the now self-sustaining and largely meaningless expansion of a technology which has subordinated science to its own indefinite ends, and displaced spiritual values in favour of economic indices. The end of Man is no longer ultimate union with God, but the part he plays in the expansion of the gross national product. All this is simply a reversion to a new but complex and highly dangerous barbarism.

In his Massey Lectures for 1966, broadcast by the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation under the title *American Moral Ambiguity**, Dr. Paul Goodman, an American, examines in depth contemporary American society, with its “warnings of ecological disaster, pollution, congestion, poisoning, mental disease, anomie”. Anomie, which Dr. Goodman uses in a substantive way, is defined in Webster’s Dictionary as: “a state of normlessness; a state of society in which normative standards of belief or conduct and belief have weakened or disappeared; a similar condition in an individual commonly characterised by personal disorientation, anxiety, and social isolation”.

*C.B.C. Publications, Toronto.

Man invented and devised technology, and used it. But as the technological machine grew, it began to use man. Technological requirements displaced man’s purpose. But now with the progress of automation it is beginning to reject man. Although more and more children must be processed (they still call it education) for the purposes of the machine, fewer are selected. And those who are selected are fitted like parts into a

machine whose purpose becomes all the time less comprehensible and less subject to control. “Modern corporate societies that can wield a high technology are liable to a unique temptation: since they do not exploit common labour, they may tend to exclude the majority of human beings altogether, as useless for the needs of the system and therefore as not quite persons.”

Dr. Goodman mentions three incompatible predictions about America during the next generation: an empty and meaningless success of the American style imposed on the whole world; that the country is over-reaching and bound for doom; or a rise in protest, already expressed in the revolt of the young with immorality, drug addiction, and rejection of traditional values and standards, which will end in conflict, “which will hopefully be non-violent”, but by which we may learn. Dr. Goodman regards this last as the most hopeful outcome, but considers the evidence stronger for either empty success or crack-up.

It is easy to take the view, as Dr. Goodman seems to do, that all this, like Topsy, “just happened”, and this view is encouraged by the present self-sustaining nature of the process. Technology raises *its own* problems, which, of course, *have* to be met: we have no choice, and no control over policy.

But in the larger view, this self-sustaining and from the human point of view meaningless expansion is not viable, for it is squandering the resources of the earth at a rate which in terms of centuries is suicidal. And even so, the bombs *may* go off, or the population explosion becomes a present reality.

And here we must remember that wisdom was not born in this generation. The fundamental problem of Man is survival—first as an individual and then as a group. The problems of this present must have been foreseen in the past, and the present destructive expansion may be a phase to lay the foundations for a World Government to curb it. There is mounting evidence for this view, which indeed is the only one which gives us ground for hope. For if the meaningless expansion is not after all mindless; if, behind it all, there is a policy which at present we are powerless to alter, it is a policy which can be altered when we can get at the minds behind it. Social Crediters know there is an alternative policy, but have learnt that as things have become, they cannot apply it. Dr. Goodman sees that instead of spending 20,000 dollars to urbanise a displaced farmer, it would be much better to put him back on a farm and *give* him a thousand dollars a year for twenty years. If it is mere foolishness not to do this, we have no hope; but if it is part of a plan of wilful destruction, we may be able to destroy the destroyers: a slender hope, but all we have.

(Sept. 23, 1967.)

* * *

The Daily Express, Aug. 25, 1967, carried a report that Russia has rapidly built up its naval strength in the Mediterranean to a present fifty vessels. This build-up began with the stage-managed Israel-Arab ‘war’, and the fleet has bases in Port Said, Alexandria, Port Sudan and Hodeida, and supplies are ensured by a flotilla of supply ships, which, relative to the U.S. navy, have short supply lines to the armouries of the USSR. There is a growing fleet of troop and tank landing craft.

Europe is a relatively narrow South-West projection from the Heartland (see *T.S.C.*, Sept. 9, 1967) and the great Asian land mass. To the North-east lies the Baltic Sea, virtually a Russian lake. To the South is the Mediterranean, open only via Gibraltar at one end, and Suez at the other. On the southern flank of Europe lies Northern Africa which, if not absolutely Russian controlled, is effectively denied to the West, and particularly to U.S. ‘imperialism’. Opposite Gibraltar and adjacent to Algeria is Morocco, already rated at 80-90% Communist controlled (*American Opinion* Scoreboard 1967). And in North Africa the USSR is using the air bases built but evacuated by the U.S.

Thus it can be seen that Europe, navally, is now virtually completely out-flanked. NATO, effectively, has been dismantled. And the question of German ‘reunification’ is still an unsettled issue, which could at any time that suits the USSR become a live one. The European situation now is one in which the U.S. could hardly intervene. But the U.S. is officially “building bridges to the East”, and supplying increasing quantities of materials to the USSR which is supplying most of the munitions and other supplies which enable North Vietnam to continue the war in which already over 12,000 Americans have been slain.

There are still those who apparently believe that the now terrifying prospect before Europe has come about by the blunders of well-meaning politicians. Every step of what can now be seen as a coherent and brilliant strategy has successively been ascribed by the all-wise commentators of the mass media to a 'mistake', regardless of the fact that over half a century ago Lenin laid down the line that the road to Paris lay through Asia and Africa. Africa and Asia, apart from Southern Africa, have become not so much part of a Communist Empire as denied to the West; and yet the West is embarked on near-war with Southern Africa, via Rhodesia and South West Africa.

(Sept. 23, 1967.)

* * *

Now that the Wilson regime's crisis measures have intensified the ills which ostensibly they were supposed to cure, and have provided the occasion for Mr. Wilson to take over the direction of the British economy personally (which means control by the back-room hard-core Socialists and Communists), Britain has come under a virtual dictatorship. It is hard to know how long even as a form Parliament will survive, but that any reversal of increasingly totalitarian government will be permitted is not to be thought of. The fruits of victory of a long continued conspiracy are now at hand, and it is not to be doubted that when and if necessary, force will be used finally to consolidate the gains. Civil disorder because of unemployment and desperation; racial disorder because of unrestricted immigration; a mounting crime rate; intensifying economic crisis which is inevitable under an unmodified monetary system; the provocations of Communists open and concealed; wide-spread strikes a mounting probability—the ingredients are all there.

(Sept. 23, 1967.)

* * *

It is becoming more and more clear that it is becoming more and more the case that no matter where disaster strikes, it would be almost impossible for the U.S.A. to intervene. The problems of logistics increase while the American and British built bases diminish and even pass into Communist-controlled hands. Just about all that is left is the threat of a nuclear confrontation, and even this becomes less credible as we are told, whether truthfully or not, that the USSR is closing the nuclear 'gap' and perfecting a system of anti-missile missiles while the American Secretary for 'Defence' steadfastly refuses even to initiate such a system, which at this stage would require more time to complete than almost certainly is now available. Krushchev *meant* that he would bury us, and his boast that our grandsons would be Communists probably disguised the intent to consolidate victory well before most of us have grandchildren.

Thus our fate looks more and more inevitable. Nevertheless, it is a contrived fate, the outcome of conspiracy and subversion working towards monolithic world government, and this ultimate in pyramidal control is, as Douglas pointed out, the most susceptible to collapse, particularly in the face of informed public opinion. There are now hundreds of thousands of people with an increasing knowledge and understanding of the truth. Probably only people in positions of power *like* what is going on; and the discontent of the remainder, once informed and focused, could still stop it. The people of the 'free' world still have representatives in Parliaments, who should be subjected to all the pressure it is possible to exert to stop their Governments trading with the enemy as exemplified by the Communist-bloc countries, and to treat treason at home for what it is. We are in the midst of the gravest crisis in history, which will be resolved to our ruin unless those who recognise the reality exert themselves.

(Sept. 23, 1967.)

* * *

The British Labour Party is commonly regarded as one component of an alternating two-party system of government. But in fact this is not so. The Labour Party is an instrumentality of the Fabian Society, designed to convert Britain, gradually but irrevocably, into a region in a system of World Government maintained by force and terror. Such an objective naturally envisages the elimination by one means or another of any alternative, and any one who will look back to the Profumo and associated scandals can see the progressive destruction of the Conservative Party by the discrediting of its successive leaders and the demoralising of the rank and file. The Conservative Party simply has no *alternative* policy, and merely feebly claims a superior

ability in carrying forward a policy which the Socialists have imposed on the country, and which has reduced Britain from the premier power in the world to an off-shore island of a continent under the shadow of a Communist take-over.

The socialist objective is now so far advanced that it is doubtful whether the Socialists would submit to the risk of a general election which they were not certain to win. In 1946, under cross-examination in a libel case brought by the late Professor Laski against certain newspapers, he said: "I say that if a Labour Government is met with resistance the consequence of the resistance is government by Defence of the Realm Act, and that this exacerbates temper, which produces the *normal revolutionary situation*, or, as you like to call it, *revolution by violence*, and that then, men move by civil war." (Emphasis added.)

Fabian Socialism is a formulation of Marxism, which in turn is a formulation of a conspiracy whose *documented* existence goes back more than a quarter of a millennium. This genealogy of Fabianism guarantees the use of force in the last resort. The idea of world government has for those who entertain it the force of religious conviction. The idea of dialectical materialism is a metaphysical idea, in which history is conceived as a force bringing about events inevitably but through the agency of beings under a supra-personal necessity to carry out its dictates. Thus, Professor Laski again: ". . . The main issue the Left has to decide is when it will co-ordinate its forces for the victory which is its historic right. . . . To let that moment pass unused is a betrayal that will never be forgiven by posterity." (Next? *Statesman*, June 5, 1943.) Laski envisaged a full understanding with the leaders of the Soviet Union, to give to the revolution "a creative power against which the forces of reaction will hurl themselves in vain".

But to the Soviet leaders Fabian Socialism is "a petty-bourgeois expedient", to be extirpated with its leaders in the interest of Communist World Government. And if the sedulously cultivated civil war breaks out in the U.S.A., there will not be long to wait.

(Oct. 7, 1967.)

* * *

At this culmination of the world crisis, two observations made by the late C. H. Douglas during the Second World War deserve further attention. The first is from *Programme For the Third World War*: "I suppose about two thousand millions of individuals are affected by the present war. I should place the number of individuals who would be unable to say with approximate accuracy what it is about at roughly nineteen hundred and ninety-nine millions, so that we are left with this simple alternative. Either the total population of the world likes war without knowing what it is about; in which case it is obviously absurd to do anything to abolish it; or, on the other hand, we can find the causes of war if we examine the actions of a minority hidden amongst less than a million individuals.

"It appears to me (but, of course, I may be wrong) to be elementary and incontestable that it wouldn't really matter much what this minority did or thought, if they were not in control of mechanisms which enabled them to force the other nineteen hundred and ninety-nine millions to take part in a war they didn't understand and didn't want. If I am not wrong in this, it appears equally incontestable, that you can prevent war amongst the nineteen hundred and ninety-nine millions if you destroy the power of the small minority over them. . . .

"Now it is equally incontestable that every effort possible is being made to increase, and, in fact, render impregnable the power of this minority over the majority.

"Unless there is some flaw in the argument which has escaped me, war is even more certain and more certain to be universal and devastating, as a result of this concentration of control, than it was in 1939. Fascism and Bolshevism only enter into it as the two parties enter into a parliamentary contest."

In fact, the World War never ceased; it was transformed into the so-called Cold War, whose casualties by way of massacre, famine and deportations run in the millions. In Vietnam, the rate of bombing has for many months massively exceeded that of any stage of the 'Second' World War. This continuing devastation of the world is sustained primarily by the industrial and productive power of the U.S.A., which appears in

the contest, however, as the ‘opponent’ of the USSR, “as the two parties enter into a parliamentary contest”.

The minority responsible for the increasing world catastrophe, however, is not confined to any one country. It is an international group increasingly controlling the governments of the more significant countries of the world. Yet in 1948 there was a vital alteration in the picture.

One of Douglas’s predictions was that New York-Washington would emerge as the centre of world financial control and Palestine as the centre of world political control. And that brings us to the second of Douglas’s observations referred to above.

(Dec. 2, 1967.)

* * *

“Zionism is something very different to a simple scheme for the return of the Jews to Palestine. That is incidental to the moulding of events and Governments to procure a World Dominion for ‘Israel’. The objective involves a perfectly clear, coherent, and continuous policy on the part of the Zionists. The conditions for successive and major crises must be created and maintained in the world; the means to deal with each crisis as it arises must be in the hands of Zionist Jews, directly *or indirectly* [our emphasis]: and the use of these means must only be granted to the highest bidder in the surrender of power or the guarantee of its use in the interests of Jewry. In the past, the control of money, gold, and credit, has been the primary weapon of the Zionist.

“But the money myth has been exploded; and legal control of raw materials is essential to the pursuit of the policy to a final and successful issue. Genuine and unfettered private property of any description whatever is absolutely fatal to it. . . (*The Brief for the Prosecution*: 1944)

Now it simply will not do to write this off as an expression of ‘anti-Semitism’. It expresses too exactly the course of world affairs since 1945.

In the first place, not all Zionists are Jews, just as not all Semites are Jews; and not all Jews are Zionists. In the second place, via the agency of UNNRA and the complicity of diverse Governments, masses of Jews were transferred to Palestine, simply as troops; and after a typical Communist-type campaign of terrorism, and again with the complicity of diverse Governments, this time through the agency of the UN, the State of Israel was created and recognised as an independent Power. This Power has now seized control of the Middle East, the strategic centre of the world. The emergence of the State of Israel requires that the Zionists of all races stand up to be counted in the conduct of world affairs.

The situation has been succinctly stated by M. Leon de Poncins (*The Secret Powers Behind World Revolution*): “There is a greater amount of artificiality in revolution than is believed. This is not solely to be imputed to the Jews. It is not certain that they form its most numerous elements, but, thanks to their racial qualities, they are the strategists and directors of the movement, from which they, almost alone, derive advantage.”

In the light of the evidence which has become available in the past twenty years, the “almost alone” of this quotation requires qualification. It is now evident that the bid for World Power has attracted to its inner direction evil men lusting for power all over the world, forming a directorship of quite diverse origins. And until this directorship can be isolated and interrogated, it will guard—to the death—the secrets of its composition.

(Dec. 2, 1967.)

* * *

There is now so much writing on the wall that even those who run should be able to read the message. By all appearances, the strategic conquest of Europe has been accomplished, while its occupation remains a matter of convenience. Once-Great Britain, protected from overt invasion by water—for the present—is being reduced from within to economic ruin, while her physical assets are being taken over by international financial interests. Even the possibility of biological warfare in the form of foot-and-mouth disease cannot be ruled out. The possibility of a real nuclear confrontation between the ‘two’ ‘Super’ Powers is being made

progressively less acceptable to public opinion in the U.S.A., thus paving the way for a nuclear-armed 'peace'-keeping role for the U.N. and victory for World Government. And then counter-revolution can be put down by practised Communist techniques.

(Dec. 16, 1967.)

* * *

An extraordinary report by the Assistant Editor appeared in *The Sunday Telegraph* (London) on Nov. 5, 1967. Headlined "Russian Troops Are Training In France", it states that Red Army troops are *already* (our emphasis) training with French forces on French soil as part of a Franco-Soviet military exchange programme, while the two Governments are reported to be discussing joint staff talks and even the exchange of staff officers at each other's headquarters. A visit by Marshal Zakharov, the Soviet Chief of General Staff, coincided with the biggest French air manoeuvres held since the war—an exercise which had as its working hypothesis disturbances in Berlin and East Germany leading to the encircling of Berlin by Red Army forces.

De Gaulle is constantly depicted as an egocentric super patriot; but his total record is one of consistently pursuing Communist objectives.

(Dec. 16, 1967.)

* * *

Prime Minister Wilson who early in his administration received the adulation of the mass media, is now receiving an increasingly bad press, which makes it appear that his real role as the Kerensky of the British Revolution is about to be made apparent. As Lenin laid down, the time for the Communist take-over is when the proletariat becomes convinced that even Social Democracy cannot save them from the oppression of the 'Capitalists'. And, of course, the economic policies imposed by Wilson are providing the necessary conviction.

It is several years since we published in these pages articles entitled *Now Or Never*, and *The Last Chance*, suggesting in outline the economic policy which if pursued with faith and courage might have saved Britain. But even at the end of World War II, the late C. H. Douglas was profoundly pessimistic, because he recognised the utter ruthlessness of the Conspirators who, he knew, recognised the Anglo-Saxon *character* as the greatest danger to their plans. There is no sign of danger to those plans now. But the danger to Anglo- Saxons is extreme.

(Dec. 16, 1967.)

* * *

The Portuguese Foreign Minister, Dr. Nogueira, combines in his Press statements a high degree of political realism with a nicety of diplomatic language which perhaps does not allow him to spell out all the implications of his observations. He observes that the reality following the Arab-Israeli war is the vast expansion of Russian power in the Middle East. But the question is: by what other means than such a war could such a situation have been brought about? But for the existence of Israel, the Russian infiltration into the Middle East would be seen as aggression, of potentially and probably fatal consequence to Europe.

It cannot be conceded that the diplomats of the West are so inferior in comprehension to Dr. Nogueira that they cannot see this situation; but they do not speak of it. But who would doubt that they would view with extreme alarm an anti-Communist build-up in the Middle East? Thus it can be seen that the creation of 'Israel' was a long-term strategical move of crucial importance.

(Jan. 27, 1968.)

* * *

An article by Jon Kimche in *The Illustrated London News*, Dec. 30, 1967, describes the actuality of the Russian presence in the Middle East and North Africa, and discloses that seventy percent of the world's oil reserves are in this area, and that the total number of Soviet personnel in six Arab countries is 25,000. But, of course, within this 25,000 are the men with their fingers on the triggers of the complex armaments of today.

An accompanying map shows that an arc with Odessa as its centre and with a radius of only 1,600 miles covers the vital Middle East area from Algiers to Kuwait. This area, and France, *are denied to the West.*

(Jan. 27, 1968.)

* * *

The British Government is constantly being exhorted to get out of debt. With the sudden ending of Lend-Lease in 1945, the then Labour Government borrowed nearly a thousand million pounds sterling from the U.S.A.—and squandered it. Since then there have been various other borrowings, together with repayments of principal and the payment of interest. Nevertheless, according to *Political Intelligence Weekly* (Jan. 5, 1968) Britain now owes nearly 40% *more* than the amounts originally borrowed.

This debt, of course, is an instrument of control over British policy—while it sticks by the rules of a non-self-liquidating financial system, the British Government is not a free agent. But the disgusting feature is that the Wilson administration appears to revel in the situation instead of denouncing it. And the ‘Conservatives’ are too brainwashed to be aware of it.

(Jan. 27, 1968.)

* * *

An A.B.C. news broadcast on Jan. 12, 1968, announced that the Wilson administration is implementing an agreement with Moscow for technological co-operation between Britain and the USSR, including, probably, the exchange of technicians. As is made clear in the carefully documented book *Peace or Peaceful Coexistence* the Central Committee of the Communist Party is *absolutely confident* of final victory for Communism, ‘peaceful coexistence’ being nothing but the strategy of disarmament of anti-communism.

Because de Gaulle and Wilson do not proclaim themselves Communists, and are not known to carry Party cards, most people are disinclined to regard them as Communists. But in practice, a Communist is anyone who furthers Communist objectives. Wilson is at least a Fabian Socialist, adhering to the ultimate objective of Communism—One-World Government. De Gaulle’s achievement is not to have excluded Britain from Europe, but to have wrecked NATO. Britain can be acquired as a province—“Airstrip No. 1”—when the time is ripe.

Forget Communism if you like—the word has been made disreputable. But watch anti-anti-Communism progressing like a forest fire, and recall some elementary algebra.

(Jan. 27, 1968.)

* * *

The only fresh significance in the Wilson Administration’s fresh instalment of disarmament and depression is that it probably marks the absolute point of no return. That is to say, that in the highly unlikely event of a new and genuinely patriotic and informed Administration coming to power, it could not retrieve the situation. The Greatness of Great Britain was a financial phenomenon, backed, of course, by military and naval sanctions. From being the world’s creditor, Britain has become the world’s bankrupt, disarmed and disgraced and administered by traitors. Shooting the latter might be feasible and exemplary, but even a reformed financial system without the protection of physical sanctions could no longer restore Greatness.

In 1960 we published in these pages an essay entitled *The Last Chance: A Conspectus*. It recommended a “course of action [which] would rapidly bring into the open the real situation we are in, and we should soon see whether it is still possible to extricate ourselves, or whether it is already too late. If we do not do this, the end is certain, so that at least we should be backing a chance against a certainty”. As Douglas quoted: “*Si monumentum requirit, circumspice*”.

(Jan. 27, 1968.)

* * *

The Conservative Party has not been out of office so long that its leaders can be presumed to have

become ignorant of the economic realities of the British situation. In opposing British withdrawal from the Middle East they are implicitly opposing a political rather than an economic decision, since if the Conservatives would not withdraw, they must know that a British presence and commitment is economically feasible.

What is not feasible is a British return. There is no such thing as a power vacuum; there is a transformation from a balance of power to a disequilibrium. The USSR of course is incomparably better placed to maintain their position in the Middle East than the British ever were, because of their control of what Halford Mackinder called the "Heartland".

No other conclusion seems possible than that Mr. Wilson and his entourage is privy to all this. They are internationalists, looking for a One World Government which necessarily must have the sanctions of government, which implies the destruction of the sanctions to maintain national sovereignty and independence. The destruction accomplished becomes irreversible, and Britons, so long as they survive, slaves forever. In the face of the population 'explosion', survival in the coming world is obviously a matter of belonging to the power structure, from which, under Wilson, Britain is finally excluded. The Conservatives had and squandered their last chance.

(Feb. 10, 1968.)

* * *

Now that the USSR has secured its position as a, or perhaps the, Mediterranean naval power, the Egyptians are re-opening the Suez Canal.

Prior to the June Israeli-Arab 'war'—in reality, manoeuvre—the Middle East situation might be likened to a supersaturated chemical solution. The 'war' effected an immediate crystallization. This is a catastrophe for 'the West' far greater than any disaster in the 1939-1945 war, because the world's most important strategic area is now under the control of a Power which is determined on world conquest. The mistake, if it was a mistake, of the West in the 1939 war was to have no clear post-war policy; and, unless it is complicity in a design for World Government, it has none now. The USSR, on the other hand, as the military arm of world conspiracy has pursued a long-term strategy which almost certainly included the rise and fall of Nazi Germany and the current embroilment of the U.S.A. in a no-win war in Asia.

(Feb. 10, 1968.)

* * *

As isolated events, the strikes and disorders fomented by Communists seem to appear to most people as self-defeating nuisances. In fact they are rehearsals for C-Day—World Conquest Day or World Crisis Day. Top Communists are the product of an educational and training process as thorough as a university course* Marxian theory deduces the breakdown of 'Capitalism', producing a universal economic crisis. International financial practice is *engineering* the breakdown by persistence in a monetary system which in the long-run will not work, and which can be seen already not to be working. International Finance could at any time in the past fifty years have rectified the system, and did not do so because the *consequences* of the defects are the *policy* of the controllers, leading to C-Day when a small minority of trained and rehearsed Communist Party members will be able to paralyse all 'Capitalist' countries simultaneously.

*See Benjamin Gitlow: *The Whole of Their Lives*.

Even the most superficial examination of the world situation makes it plain that the U.S.A.—the only Power that could—is not disposing its forces in such a way as to conquer the USSR; but it is equally plain that the USSR is disposing its forces in such a way as to conquer the world. Many Americans—but not nearly enough—now recognise that the Watts, Detroit and numerous other destructive riots have been planned rehearsals for something much more deadly serious. The amount of destruction entailed is of no more consequence to the World Planners than the massive destruction of the two World Wars, for this is intended to be final and irrevocable victory for World Government—a victory now so near as to be almost palpable.

We have frequently quoted Douglas's observation that the World Planners "care no more for the immolation of the peoples of a continent than for the death of a sparrow". Clearly this applies as much to the peoples of the U.S.A. as to any others. Equally clearly, most Americans do not recognise this: "It can't happen here." But how many Britons foresaw how much wreckage the Wilson Administration would achieve in a little more than three years?

(Feb. 10, 1968.)

* * *

Sir Arthur Bryant, writing in *The Illustrated London News*, Jan. 27, 1968, observes: "Despite the inevitable short-comings and mistakes of any institution operated by fallible human beings, the British Empire, above all the British raj in the east, during its period of ascendancy increased the sum total of justice, impartially and pacifically enforced law, and a certain kindness and mercifulness of dealing—qualities in its rulers of which mankind has stood in need ever since human society began and stands in desperate need today." And he quotes the philosopher George Santayana writing of the British colonial administrator and serviceman: that "never since the heroic days of Greece has the world had such a sweet, just, boyish master. It will be a black day for the human race when scientific blackguards, conspirators, churls and fanatics manage to supplant him".

That day has come, says Sir Arthur. But to Mr. Richard Crossman devaluation and withdrawal from 'East of Suez' are "giant strides towards the historic mission of British Socialism".

Of course, there is no such thing as 'British' socialism. As Marx said, the British are too stupid to make their own revolution, therefore foreigners must make it for them. The overall benevolence of British colonialism was the outcome of the Anglo-Saxon character, which was mutilated in two contrived world wars, and swamped by alien immigration.

Sir Arthur says: "There are certain transmitted qualities in the British fighting services, allied with certain temperamental aptitudes in the British character when conditioned by discipline and *esprit de corps*, which are ideally suited for dealing with the violence engendered by inflamed popular passions and for combating the kind of war to which such passions and the Communist technique of infiltration and armed intimidation give rise. It has grown out of our history, and particularly our military and naval history, and is a quality of great price, desperately needed in the world of today."

(Feb. 24, 1968.)

* * *

Sir Arthur Bryant quotes William White in the *Washington Post* of Nov. 22, 1967 as referring to "Prime Minister Harold Wilson's despairing courage in cutting the value of the pound sterling, once the most powerful currency on this earth. . . ." But Richard Crossman gives the lie to that one. Courage to attenuate old age pensioners' purchasing power; to rob the thrifty of the value of their savings; to rob patriots of their dedicated careers and face them with the miseries of unemployment? Or scientific blackguardism, conspiracy, churlishness and fanaticism? A despairing courage which seeks solace in banquets in Moscow and Washington? But perhaps Prime Minister Wilson will proceed to New York to assist in removing the garbage with which Socialism's historic mission has clogged the streets.

(Feb. 24, 1968.)

* * *

U.S. News & World Report in its issue of Feb. 12, 1968 says that the French are reported to be aiming their missiles at capitals of Western nations. And the Wilson administration is dismantling the civil defence organisation, and destroying its records. Thus Europe, including Britain, appears ripe for a Communist take-over, perhaps without a shot being fired. Does anyone think Khrushchev was joking when he said that the Communists will bury us? The U.S. looks like being in the position of the man who was buried as the richest man in the cemetery. Writing from New York for *Spectator* of Feb. 9, 1968, Murray Kempton says that "the last two weeks have left us a defeated people. . . . The United States is already so drained by its

commitments in Vietnam that it was helpless in the Arab-Israeli crisis and can only palter with North Korea about the 'Pueblo'. In this sense Mr. Johnson is dependent on the restraint and the kindness of his enemies. It is a mark of his helplessness that he clings to the hope that they will help. . . We have seen something of the 'kindness' of the enemy in the actions of the Viet Cong, in case anyone has forgotten the methods employed to crush the Hungarian revolt.

(Feb. 24, 1968.)

* * *

EPITAPH FOR OUR TIMES: The king by judgment establisheth the land: but he that receiveth gifts overthroweth it. *Proverbs XXIX: 4.*

(Feb. 24, 1968.)

* * *

The London *Sunday Express*, Feb. 11, 1968 concludes its editorial with the paragraph: "The Government's policy does not even begin to make sense."

This simple theme is that on which probably the majority of the political commentators who make their living by marketing their opinions base their complex but on the whole discordant variations. But perhaps the discordance arises from a flaw in the theme, and the real question is: in what context does the Government's policy make sense? For nobody ever seems to accuse Mr. Wilson and several of his colleagues of any failure in intellect or ability; rather the reverse.

Mr. Wilson, most of his colleagues, his promoters and his (mostly concealed) backers, are *Socialists*. To the true Socialist, whether of the Communist or Fabian variety, Socialism is Internationalism, of which the main component is the destruction of nationalism and the emergence of world government.

If Mr. Wilson were to address the British nation and say: "The measures being taken by my Government are designed to fit this country into a world-wide system of government, and this necessarily requires the transfer of national sovereignty in all its forms to international institutions, and the merging of all forms of economic activity under more and more centralised direction under the control of overseas capital, etc." he might have some justifiable fears for his own safety, if he hasn't already. But by creating the conditions of recurring economic crises, the objectives of Socialism can be achieved under the aspect of emergency. Thus Mr. Richard Crossman was exulting, not dissimulating, when he pronounced devaluation and the exodus from the East as "giant strides towards Socialism".

In real terms—i.e., in ability to produce the goods and services required *by its own people*—Britain is ever more wealthy. The physical limitation imposed on this ability is the necessity to import the raw materials other than the imports required for exports. This is a problem which could easily have been dealt with within the confines of the English-speaking Commonwealth—so long as Britain maintained the military sanctions to enable her to mind her own business. Since the premise of international Socialism is that nations should have their business managed for them by international Authorities, the disarming of Britain and the international cartelisation of her industry make entire sense. And since this process goes against the grain of the Anglo- Saxon character, the destruction of the latter by mongrelisation, subversion, and mis-education is equally to be expected.

The true but unspoken slogan of Socialism is "all proletarians are equal": factory-fodder.

(March 9, 1968.)

* * *

The people with their fingers on the triggers of the atomic bombs and missiles are those who have far and away the most to lose if the bombs go off. This fact exposes the hideous reality of the war in Vietnam. A fraction of the fire-power unleashed by the U.S. in Vietnam, if directed to the nerve centre of Viet Cong *control* would terminate the war in very short order. But in fact the U.S. is supplying Russia which is supplying North Vietnam, thus keeping the war going. The object, of course, is to 'defeat' the U.S. without

damaging its industrial equipment, which is what the Communists are after. As a result of the ‘escalation’ of the war, the U.S. is very seriously depleted not of gross man power, but of key personnel such as pilots and technicians in various critical fields, and therefore is in no condition to police or protect the rest of the ‘free’ world. In this situation, Europe is probably vulnerable to mere ultimatum; and following Europe, the U.S. itself.

All the ingredients of catastrophe appear now to be fused, probably to be detonated by a universal economic crisis (‘collapse’ of the dollar). In contemplating the mess, remember that many of the *top* Communists or call them what you will are, perhaps temporarily, resident in the U.S.

(March 9, 1968.)

* * *

The A.B.C. chose as its Guest of Honour on Feb. 18, 1968 Sir Hugh Greene, Director-General of the B.B.C. In his talk, Sir Hugh made much of the independence conferred on the B.B.C. by virtue of the fact that its income is derived from individual licence fees and not from centralised, such as government, funds—an observation which highlights the dependence of socialised medicine and education. The B.B.C., said Sir Hugh, is independent of outside pressures and is thus free to use its own judgment in presenting both sides of controversial issues—like (he did not say) the parson who after preaching the Christian view of morality, concluded his sermon by presenting the Devil’s view. But Sir Hugh did emphasise one exception to the B.B.C.’s impartial morality, or immorality—the one unqualified evil he admitted to is racialism. This is rather like the roué who, proposing to seduce the sweet young maiden, took her for a carriage ride through the brothel district. The sure provocation to racialism is the publicity accorded it.

The B.B.C. may be free from outside pressures; but what is certain is that it is subject to the internal pressures of subversion and corruption. This is euphemised by Sir Hugh as ‘freedom’ for programme directors to present material as they see fit, and the result of this lack of moral (or immoral) restraint was described by Kenneth Young in an article in the *Sunday Express* of Sept. 17, 1967: “Day after day by omission, slant, innuendo—or even a tone of voice—news is far from objectively presented. . . . Why . . . have religious programmes been progressively drained of specifically religious content? . . . Such subjects as abortion and homosexuality were hammered at by the B.B.C. far beyond what their importance justified. . . . In the same way, drug taking became the staple fare of discussion and enquiry programmes to the point where a minority problem was boosted into something like incitement. A constant stream of plays and documentaries presented life as both sordid and sexually loose, marriage and family life as ludicrously old hat, and religion as beneath consideration.” And Mr. Young quotes Sir Hugh, as reported in *Time* magazine, as saying: “The programme [*Till Death Us Do Part*] offends a great many people—but those one is glad to offend.”

The caption to Mr. Young’s article remarks that B.B.C. programmes—TV and radio—“seem intended to undermine Britain and the standards of the people”; and Mr. Young writes: “Oddly enough, what they are doing at the B.B.C. is *exactly* what Communism would *like* to do.”

Guest of *Honour*? Well, there is said to be honour among thieves, who no doubt would unanimously agree as to the immorality of birds of a feather flocking together. Perhaps when the mixed flock of Communists have exterminated the Vietnamese, they will turn their attention to the sparrows, swans, and birds of Paradise.

(March 9, 1968.)

* * *

Sir John Glubb spent thirty-six years living among the Arabs. From 1939 to 1956 he was in command of the Arab Legion, the little army of the State of Trans-Jordan. By reason of this, he knew at first hand and with military percipience the realities military, strategic and political of the Israeli war on the Arabs with its typical Communist atrocities and propaganda. He writes of all this in his book *A Soldier With the Arabs*.*

*Hodder and Stoughton: London, 1957.

As early as 1939 the late C. H. Douglas recognised that the creation of the State of Israel was one of the real as opposed to the ostensible aims of the Second World War, and that this aim was a strategic objective of what we now recognise as the International Communist Conspiracy. Glubb Pasha, as Sir John is more widely known, recalls that within hours of the ending of the British mandate in Palestine, the *U.S. and Russia* recognised the State of Israel, and that during the U.N. ‘truce’ in the Israeli-Arab war “an aerial ferry was working constantly between Czecho-Slovakia and Israel, bringing in more arms from behind the Iron Curtain”. When Israel’s victory was assured, Russia consoled the Arabs with (unfortunately, well-based) propaganda that their defeat was due to England and the U.S.A., who under the U.N. truce embargoed arms supplies to the Arabs.

This lucrative strategy was repeated with swift precision in the Israeli-Arab war of June, 1967. The USSR egged the Arabs on to certain defeat, and then supported the U.N. cease-fire. Under the guise of replacing Arab losses, the USSR moved in fresh military equipment, *and technicians*. It is reported that the Arabs are given instruction *in Russian*.

In the light of all this, what Sir John had to say concerning the effect of the first Israeli-Arab war is particularly instructive: “In former times, when armies moved overseas, they did so accompanied by their weapons and administrative requirements. Today, the transport of personnel and the transport of material are widely different problems. The men of whole armies can be flown over seas and continents in a matter of days, if not hours. But the material which they need has never before been so difficult to move. The problem of transporting tanks, guns, vehicles and heavy ammunition is immense. Not only so, but the maintenance of these weapons in the field requires an extensive organisation of workshops and stores. If, therefore, either side can preposition its material in peace-time, in the theatre of possible operations, so that only the personnel need be flown out, then that army will be the first in action when the war begins.”

The USSR and its ‘satellites’, the State of Israel, and the U.S.A. *Administration*—not the citizens of the U.S.A.—are all aspects of the International Communist Conspiracy. The strategic problem of the Conspiracy is to confront the citizens of the U.S.A. with a situation where it would be *evidently* impracticable for the U.S.A. to oppose militarily action by the USSR firstly in the Middle and Far East, and then in Europe.

In short, no alternative but nuclear war by push-button. Following the crash of the U.S. hydrogen bomb armed aircraft in Greenland, the rest of these strategic bombers have been grounded. It is *said* that they can be airborne in fifteen minutes—but airborne where? If the continuous flights were originally deemed essential for the security of Europe—the nuclear ‘umbrella’—has the necessity vanished?

Politics is the art of the possible. But what we are witnessing is the narrowing of alternative possibilities to vanishing point. In the 1920’s reform of the defective financial system could have saved Christian civilisation. That possibility has been eliminated in the existing context. In the 1950’s Britain, by consolidating the English-speaking Commonwealth to an economically viable unit might have disrupted the Conspiracy’s strategy. But Britain is now disarmed and thus deprived of any power of independent initiative. Nuclear war by the U.S.A. . . . ?

(March 23, 1968.)

* * *

A Reuter news item, published, but not prominently, in the London *Daily Telegraph* of March 3, 1968, reports that the Indian Navy will be in “complete charge” of the Indian Ocean when the British Navy withdraws. The Indian Navy is to be enlarged, most of the equipment to come from Russia. These arrangements follow talks between Mr. Kosygin and Mrs. Ghandi in February. “The move apparently paves the way towards the formation of a mobile fleet to operate in the Indian Ocean.”

As Russian supplies imply Russian operatives, it is not difficult to see what sort of mobility the Indian Navy will exercise. As *U.S. News & World Report*, Jan. 29, 1968 observes: “Indian Ocean area is vast, the back door to Southeast Asia and the strategic way to India, East Africa, much of the oil-rich Middle East.”

If the Tories got back to power, do they really believe they could put the clock back? There is no power vacuum: British power is being replaced, day by day, by Communist power—the military basis of One World Government, the objective of the Wilson regime.

(April 6, 1968.)

* * *

The tragedy of opposition to Communism lies in a failure fully to understand what Communism actually is. Communism is the power-structure of a system of world government designed to replace the world government which hitherto has been exercised through centralised international control of the financial system—a control which, since 1914, has largely been directed to the destruction of the British Empire, and latterly to destruction of Britain as a nation; and to the building up of the Communist Empire as a means of rule by force. The last target is the American *public*, and the gold ‘crisis’ is a warning that that universal economic crisis, so long foretold, is nearly upon us. When the dollar ‘falls’, as inevitably it must under the operation of the gold ‘standard’, the way will be open to overt world government. At this late stage, only the *demonstration* (such as was thwarted in Alberta) that an alternative financial system could reverse the forces which have brought about the present world crisis offers a remaining hope.

(April 6, 1968.)

* * *

The Spectator, March 15, 1968 remarks: “The Chancellor of the Exchequer sits down this weekend to put the finishing touches to his Budget against the backcloth of the biggest convulsion the international monetary system has known since the war. If this does not concentrate Mr. Jenkin’s mind and strengthen his resolve, then nothing will.” Well—of course. ‘Mr. Jenkins’ budget is the culmination of the wrecking economic policies which the Wilson regime was installed to accomplish, so that it is only natural that a suitable backcloth should be provided. It is now evident that the final collapse of sterling has been engineered to trigger the collapse of the dollar, thus precipitating the universal economic crisis planned to usher in the Communist take-over.

The barrage of economic ‘analyses’ (which all follow the same line) to which the populations of the industrialised countries are being subjected are irrelevant. The international financiers know exactly what they are doing. Crisis is their *policy*—to prevent reform of a system which concentrates world power in their hands, until such time as a policed World Government is achieved.

(April 6, 1968.)

* * *

The attendance of representatives of numerous foreign Governments at the funeral of the assassinated gaol-bird and mobster the Reverend Dr. Martin Luther King is an ominous indication of the *modus operandi* of the impending attempt at the final takeover of America by the International Communist Conspiracy. It has been said of King that riots followed in his wake as night follows day.

In a speech to a crowd of 35,000 in Chicago on July 10, 1966, King said: “We are tired of being seared in the flames of withering injustice. . . . We are tired of being lynched physically in Mississippi, and we are tired of being lynched spiritually and economically in the North. . . . There is no time to engage in the luxury of cooling off or to take a tranquillizing drug of gradualism. . . . Now is the time to have a confrontation in the city of Chicago between the forces resisting change and the forces demanding change. . . . We will no longer sit idly by in agonising deprivation and wait on others to provide our freedom. We will be badly mistaken if we think freedom is some lavish dish that the federal government and the white man will pass out on a silver platter. . . . Freedom is never voluntarily granted by the oppressor. It must be demanded by the oppressed. The battle [is] in our hands. . . . This day we must decide to fill up the jails of Chicago, if necessary, in order to end slums.” Two days later the Watts rampage broke out.

If a couple, one married and the other not, engage in sexual intimacy, the act is called adultery; and if detection is followed by a petition for divorce, the married partner is referred to as the Respondent, and the

other as the Co-respondent. It has not been proved that King was a Communist, but it has been proved that he has continuously engaged in acts of political intimacy with known Communists, such as Gus Hall, Secretary of the CPUSA, while James Dombrowski, the Executive Director of the Southern Conference Educational Fund, which sponsored King, is an identified Communist. So the political word for King is “Co-communist”. Communists are ‘married’ to the Cause; King had ‘affairs’ with it.

The true facts about King have long since been ascertained and published, and must be known to the intelligence agencies of the so-called anti-communist governments represented at his funeral. But the suppression by the mass-media of these facts, and the elevation of King to the stature of a hero, is evidence almost conclusive in itself of the operation of an International Conspiracy engaged in imposing Communism *from the top*.

And yet, the riots triggered off by King’s exhortations, destructive as they are, are not yet the real Revolution. They are preparation. They compound the problems they are supposed to resolve. The real explosion will occur when, either by a severe contraction of credit*, or a wild inflation of currency, a universal economic crisis is brought about. For the heart and brain of the Conspiracy is the International Financial Power, the real but largely unrecognised World Government, whose power is threatened by the overwhelming productivity of modern industry. The ration card, in one form or another, is the ultimate instrument of government; and it is to maintain the power to impose the conditions of access to the necessities of life that the Terror is being prepared.

(May 4, 1968.)

*Since this note was written, the Federal Reserve Board has increased its interest rate to the highest since a similar increase touched off the Great Depression. The vitally important point to realise is that the economic system as we know it has reached the limits of its viability, and that its controllers undoubtedly know how to rectify it. The conclusion is inescapable that it is the consequences of breakdown which is the objective of the Conspirators.

* * *

The massive evidence of the organisation underlying and strategy pursued in the civil disorders in the U.S.A. is surveyed and liberally illustrated in *Communist Revolution in the Streets* by Gary Allen*. Mr. Allen “donned beatnik clothes and grew a beard to see Communist-controlled agitation from the inside”. Thus this book is based on first-hand observation; but as well it contains much material based on research into the main groups organised to exploit different sets of grievances and discontents. Autonomous in appearance, the groups are integrated and coordinated by the Communist Party which, as well as exploiting grievances, works assiduously to create and compound them. The Communist Party works on the principle that a very small number of trained Communists, disciplined and dedicated, and working to a strategy laid down from above, can control large organisations.

*Western Islands, Belmont, Massachusetts 02178. Pp. 115, illustrated.

Every effort is made by the mass media to represent poverty and discrimination as the exclusive cause of rioting. In fact, in general the American Negro is very well off; where poverty exists, it is in the main due to a disinclination to take advantage of the opportunities the American economy offers for betterment. This latter situation is aggravated by the War on Poverty whose funds, as revealed in numerous articles in the magazines *Human Events* and *American Opinion*, are actively used not only to encourage idleness but to promote discontent and disorder.

While nothing can be done outside the U.S.A. about the situation disclosed and analysed by Mr. Allen, his book nevertheless has a highly important relevance throughout the ‘free’ world, all of which is scheduled for Communist takeover, as revealing the technique by which revolution is being fomented even in prosperous communities. A knowledge of this technique makes plain the enormous misrepresentations carried by the mass media.

Mr. Allen concludes: “The Communists believe—and with good reason—that they are on the very threshold of their ultimate conquest—the United States. Why should they quit now when they can literally taste victory? They have been striving for this moment for more than fifty years. Would it make sense to

‘mellow’ and quit now? . . .

“One Communist, who happens to be a Negro, expresses it this way, ‘We call the whites “cream puffs”. We feel that when the television stops, when the telephone no longer rings, their world will almost come to an end . . . they’ll sit and wait for television to come back on’. Then it will all be over.”

(May 4, 1968.)

* * *

There can be little doubt left that Co-communist Harold Wilson’s cabal constitutes a white minority inverted-racist* dictatorship. The London *Sunday Telegraph*, March 31, 1968, quotes a detective as saying “In all my experience I have never known a Prime Minister need such protection”. The newspaper reports that his mere appearance is enough to provoke fury. “Fears for Mr. Wilson’s personal safety whenever he now leaves London have produced the strictest security precautions taken to guard a Prime Minister in recent years.” It is not reported whether instructions have been issued—yet—for the dismantling of lamp posts.

*“Mummy what is a snob?”

“A snob, darling, is a person who avoids associating with people he considers socially inferior.”

“Well, what, is an *inverted* snob?”

“That is a person who conspicuously mixes with people he considers socially inferior so as to prove he is not a snob.”

In the light of the existing international situation, the cabal has probably irretrievably damaged Britain’s economy—by, so to say, drilling holes in the petrol tank and oil sump, while calling for more acceleration. In these circumstances it is perhaps conceivable that Mr. Wilson will after all consent to a general election in due course, so as to set the Tories up for the Communists to knock down. On the other hand, Marxist theory demands that it should be the Social Democrats who should finally demonstrate that ‘capitalism’ cannot govern.

However that may be, under cover of enforcing racial integration (none so British as the West Indians), the cabal is to set up ‘Special’ Courts which look like being the forerunners of Peoples’ Courts. The end is not yet.

(May 4, 1968.)

* * *

Having demonstrated that over half a million U.S. military personnel, equipped with the most modern arms and support, and backed by the most intensive bombing in history, cannot prevent the North Vietnamese virtually overrunning South Vietnam and wrecking the pacification programme, the U.S. Secretary for Defence has announced that it is now U.S. policy to hand over the major conduct of war to the South Vietnamese. Of course, as well as trading with the USSR and its East European satellites, who together supply 80% of North Vietnam’s supplies, the U.S. *has* built bases and harbour facilities which will come in very useful to the Communists when the South Vietnamese civilian government collapses, which has clearly been the objective of the Co-communists in Washington since before they connived in the murder of the Diems. Some sections of South Vietnamese cities, especially Saigon and Hue, have been reduced to rubble, and there are hundreds of thousands of refugees, thanks to *American* bombing. So the U.S. Administration will be able quite truthfully to say: “Look, with all we have done, the South has collapsed, and how can we now prevent the dominoes falling?”

Perhaps, in due course, Australia will have its port facilities bombed out of existence to prevent Communist landings. After all, Australia is paying an insurance premium of a few hundred dead to ensure American ‘protection’.

(May 4, 1968.)

* * *

The late C. H. Douglas described modern war as a prizefight between A and B for the benefit of C, the promoter. The nigh incredible course of the Vietnam war, the official lies about its progress and prospects, its callous brutality where Americans bomb parts of South Vietnamese cities hopefully expecting to kill Viet Cong believed to be in them (never mind the civilians and their dwellings), the ‘peace’ talks which don’t happen, make this war something worse than a prize fight. But whatever it is, it is clearly for the benefit of C—the Conspiracy. For the ‘escalation’ of the war has been made possible by American trade with Russia and the East Europe satellites, who supply 80% of North Vietnam’s supplies.

According to twelve foremost U.S. ex-officers, including former chairmen of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, former chief of naval operations, former head of Strategic Air Command, and former head of Vietnam air operations, . . . the war against North Vietnam can be irrevocably won in six weeks Communist intimidations and aggressions in the free areas of Asia can also be struck a paralysing blow in the same brief frame of time. . . .” (Lloyd Malian in *Science & Mechanics*, March 1968, reported in *Human Events*, March 23, 1968). Only mass media-backed official lies obscure the truth of this assessment.

The benefits to the Conspiracy include worldwide public confusion of thought, division of communities, distortion of the U.S. economy, the acceleration of ‘civil rights’ riots towards revolutionary civil war, world-wide student demonstrations, the building of bases in South Vietnam for eventual use for the policing of South East Asia by the Communists, and the hastening of universal economic crisis with any hope of a rational solution drowned in the confusion.

To grasp the enormities of the Vietnam ‘war’ is to comprehend the magnitude of the disaster which confronts us. The Conspiracy intends to rule the Earth forever, and in the pursuit of this objective (“the highest stakes in history”) “the immolation of the peoples of a continent mean no more than the death of a sparrow”.

(May 18, 1968.)

* * *

A political maxim to be borne in mind is that politicians come and politicians go, but Departments last forever. It may be true that Britain’s current immigration policy now bearing its poisonous fruit was initiated when the Conservatives were in office. But bearing in mind Marx’s dictum: “The British are too stupid to make their own revolution, therefore foreigners must make it for them”, we can see that the immigration policy was conceived by the Conspiracy, and processed probably mainly in the Commonwealth Relations Office, and merely put in the shop window by the Conservatives.

The permanent Departments are natural main targets for infiltration by agents of the Conspiracy, both Communist and Fabian orientated. How many were planted during World War II as “refugees from Hitler’s tyranny” is not known, but undoubtedly they were numerous enough.

The Greatness of Britain had its roots in the homogeneity of its population, which gave rise to a distinctive culture now to be found only in the literature and monuments of the past. Those who knew Merrie England have gone, and by now most of those who knew even the Great Britain of pre-1914 days. The slaughter of the 1914-18 war virtually eliminated the generation which was the inheritor of the native British tradition, while a swollen bureaucracy, permeated with Fabianism, planted the seeds of the ‘welfare’ State. The Great Depression, with its miseries and despair, its suicides and its ruin of small businesses, opened the way to cartelisation with international connections. Then came the 1939-45 war, followed by the Fabian-Labour Government (“only in war, or under threat of war, will a British Government embark on large-scale planning”). The Cold War, and the threat of atomic war, have provided the opportunity for the ‘British’ Governments, now barely disguised dictatorships, to embark on international planning (the complex of various alphabetical treaty organisations, not to mention the Common Market, to which the Wilson cabal desires finally to surrender the remnants of British sovereignty).

Yet something remains of the Anglo-Saxon character, as is shown in the bye-election results, and the huge support of Mr. Enoch Powell for his speech on the follies and dangers of immigration, which so enraged the Fabian-Liberal Establishment, which includes the mass-media. It was shown too when a party

for Mr. Wilson at Culdrose Naval Air Station was cancelled when of 2,000 officers and men canvassed, only 48 were prepared to go to the party (*Daily Telegraph*, London, April 18, 1968). It was shown again in the native disgust at the Wilson cabal's treatment of Rhodesia. Rhodesia, of course, is a vigorous and healthy offspring of the now submerged British character, and thus anathema to the alien Fabianism which rules Britain. It is this, probably more than 'love' of black majorities, which underlies Wilson's venom.

Strategically, Britain would appear to be completely defeated. But the continued attacks in the form of external financial and propaganda pressure, and the mounting internal subversion and rising racial tension, may indicate that the Conspiracy fears some imponderable arising from the Anglo-Saxon character.

Perhaps Peter Simple II's Wise Woman of Simpleham, who "sees the future in a drop of ink", sensed imponderables when she shrieked: "Topsyturvydom, topsyturvydom! I see men in top hats link hands with men in cloth hats, and they sing together about hope and glory. But now the sky darkens. I hear shouts. I see violence. In a place called Downing Street the men in cloth caps are dragging others, squalid cowering figures, towards the lamp posts. Ah yes, now I see the Moonfaced One among the victims. He, too, is doomed." (*Daily Telegraph*).

(May 18, 1968.)

* * *

Brigadier W. F. K. Thompson contributes a sober analysis of the NATO strategic situation to the South Africa *Daily Dispatch*, April 19, 1968. He states the roles of Russia's "very formidable" forces to be: "To defend Russian interests; to create by their presence situations favourable to the further spread of Communism; and to be ready to exploit politically favourable situations when these occur." He notes the unilateral erosion of NATO's conventional forces. "No such erosion is taking place in the East. On the contrary, military expenditure is still increasing; East Germany's by 61 percent last year." The vital point is that the Communist forces are on the spot: "American and British forces stationed at home and assigned to NATO are no substitute, operationally or as a deterrent, to those stationed in Europe." And, indeed, "Rhine Army can neither be housed nor trained in this country".

While for these reasons Brigadier Thompson believes that NATO should remain militarily strong, unfortunately he also believes that "the ideological content of Marxism will *continue* to be eroded so that the two systems of society will gradually become more and more compatible". (Emphasis added.) This, of course, is precisely what the Communists want us to believe. This is precisely what Dimitri Manuilski laid down: "To win, we shall need the element of surprise. The bourgeoisie will have to be put to sleep. . . The capitalist countries, stupid and decadent, will rejoice to co-operate in their own destruction. . . ." The element of surprise will emerge when the Eastern satellites turn out, after all, still to be in the control of hard-line Communists, while at present they are being administered to the West as increasing doses of hypnotics. And Brigadier Thompson does not note the increasing subversion and mounting tensions within the countries of Europe, the student riots and the mounting crime—all of which add up to "politically favourable situations" which the Red Army stands ready to exploit*.

*See *The State of the World* (1967) p. 17ff.

As regards the political situation of NATO, *East West Digest** (April 1968) publishes the text of the final document called the Harmel Exercise, in which is to be found "The core of the West's new policy towards the Warsaw Pact countries . . . designed to bring up-to-date NATO's attitude towards the Communist countries". The editorial analyses this document, which it calls a "non-policy" "because it is based on an illusion namely that the Communist Parties in power are no longer malevolent, imperialist and, therefore, a threat to the West. The blindness [?] of the Western politicians who drew up the directive is compounded by the fact that they appear to be sufficiently gullible to believe that Communism will democratise itself and so the two halves of their NATO ally, Germany, will be joined together peacefully and without further ado as a matter of inevitability. The 'German problem' therefore ceases to exist because they do not want it to exist". (If the politicians were "gullible", then they were selected for that very reason by the keen strategists of the Conspiracy.)

*"Church House", Petersham, Surrey.

The kernel of the Harmel Exercise is: “Each ally should play its full part in promoting an improvement in relations with the Soviet Union and the countries of Eastern and Western Europe, bearing in mind that the pursuit of *detente* must not be allowed to split the Alliance.” *East West Digest* comments: “But the authors *knew full well* when they put pen to paper that this is just exactly what has happened, precisely because France is following such a pro-Soviet and pro-*detente* policy.” (Emphasis added.) Gullible?

Detente, like escalation and other standard terms of the Liberal commentators, clearly belongs to the vocabulary of brainwashing; it brings to mind the idea of a standstill, whereas the reality is a steady erosion of NATO capability accompanied by a steady increase in Communist capability to a point where it will suddenly become apparent that NATO has no strategic, and perhaps not even tactical, options left at all. If, as is quite possible, France suddenly came out as openly Communist (don't overlook the continuous anti-American propaganda) the Rhine Army and the British troops remaining in Germany might well find themselves cut off from escape.

(May 18, 1968.)

* * *

Signs from every direction point to the culmination of the plans of the Conspiracy in the not very distant future. The situations involved have been discussed from time to time in these pages, but it may be useful to put them together, like the pieces of a jig-saw puzzle.

- In the U.S.A., racial riots of mounting violence and destructiveness, merging with student demonstrations of increasing lawlessness, anti-war protests, and the anti-poverty programme which is both incited and financed by the Administration. The coalescence of these ‘movements’ has long been planned and organised by the Communist Party U.S.A. and its higher direction. It is intended to lead to civil war and revolutions through a breakdown of the intricate mechanism of the American economy.

- The probable collapse of the civil Government in South Vietnam. This already shaky Government is to be given “increased responsibility” for the war with the North *after* the Americans have demonstrated that they can't, or won't, win it. If the North wins, either outright or by ‘tough and difficult negotiations’, the “domino theory” becomes effective.

- The emergence since the June Israeli war of the USSR as a Mediterranean power, with short lines of supply, and U.S. - and French-built Mediterranean bases available to it. Also the pre-positioning of heavy military equipment and workshop facilities in the Middle East and Red Sea areas (re-arming the Arabs).

- The erosion of NATO, discussed above.

- The virtual encirclement of Europe by the USSR with naval strength in the Baltic Sea and the Mediterranean.

- The increasing Red control of Mediterranean Africa; the growing chaos of Central Africa; and ultimately, the potential threat of a nuclear ultimatum to an over-confident Southern Africa, which is being persistently isolated in ‘world opinion’. Free Southern Africa could not survive as such in a world controlled by a One World Government.

- The deteriorating British economic and racial situation, Fabian engineered and approximating to the ‘counter revolutionary’ situation foreseen by the late Professor Harold Laski as justifying the use of force by the Government to quell it.

- The dispersal of U.S. military power, with no logistic systems to sustain action on any significant or prolonged scale except in South Vietnam.

- The U.S. growing financial crisis, which the Chairman of the Federal Reserve Board has warned is likely to be the worst since 1931. Such a crisis would trigger a universal economic crisis—which Marxian theory predicts, and for which the Communist Parties have made their strategic and tactical dispositions.

Indeed, to recall the conclusion of Douglas's 1945 article, *The Objectives of Total War*, "The world is in the grip of theorists to whom misery and death of millions is a grain of sand beside the working out of their designs".

(May 18, 1968.)

* * *

Gallup Polls, and above all the results of the British municipal elections, establish beyond doubt that the 'British' Socialist Government is now the most unrepresentative and unpopular government of modern times. No doubt the hidden influences which stage-managed its election anticipated this development, for they carefully destroyed the Conservative leadership in advance. The precipitous rise to popularity of Mr. Enoch Powell indicates that it was not specifically the immigration issue which caused this rise—because the immigration issue as such is a great problem only in some areas—but that the British recognised someone who spoke for them and their own country; for the British for centuries have been nurtured in the idea that the Englishman's home is his castle. Socialism's fundamental idea of course is government "right of entry"—not only into homes, but into the personal affairs of individuals; the card-indexing and computerising of the population.

The British, no doubt, would respond to a Cabinet of Powells as they did to the crisis of Dunkirk. The mass media are doing their worst to make sure the opportunity is not presented to them. But if it is not yet too late for public opinion to root out the traitorous Socialists and establish a patriotic Government, it is essential to recognise the truth and force of Douglas's observation that *no real solution of our problems is possible which does not traverse the canons of orthodox finance*. Any administration which succeeded the Wilson cabal with the idea that better 'management' of the economy would rectify the economic problems which are the root cause of the political problems of crime and protest would rapidly become discredited, and should this happen to a patriotic Government, the gates would be thrown wide open to the Communist reign of terror. It is precisely large-scale 'management' which compounds the problems which it is supposed to resolve—the history of every one of the nationalised industries and services is sufficient proof of that.

Douglas once, when asked what should be the first thing any country proposing to alter its financial system should do, replied "Arm to the teeth". Well, of course, Britain's teeth have been extracted. But in the condition of the world today it is just possible that *moral* armament might suffice—that is to say, a united nation supporting a patriotic Government prepared to expose and defy the powers of financial internationalism. It is not certain that at this juncture the U.S.A., which represents the *official* Headquarters of International Finance, would resort to armed force, whereas a further collapse of the economic system *is* certain to lead to Communism. If there is a way back from that impasse it lies in making suitable barter (in principle) arrangements with other countries for the supply of *necessary* raw materials, and the use of internal credit to subsidise home consumption and to restore incentive by the progressive reduction of taxation.

Every country except those already subjugated, but apparently Britain in particular, is under attack by International Finance-Communism; and Britain has been driven to the point where counter-attack is not so much the best means of defence, as the only one.

(June 1, 1968.)

* * *

Patriotism is defined as defence of or being zealous for one's country's freedom or rights; but its full meaning has its roots in human—even animal—nature. It is instinctive as, for example, sexual impulse is instinctive. Closely related is the concept of patrimony—property *inherited* from one's ancestors. Patriotism is *family* writ large; patrimony is an external inheritance as real as the individual's internal genetic inheritance. But patrimony includes more than physical property: it includes cultural differentiations—language and even dialect differences, social customs and usages, religions, arts, skills, monuments and specific histories. In this field like attracts like, so that immigrants from one country to another tend to settle in communities, reproducing, so far as possible, the cultural differentiations of the original homeland.

The internationalist endeavour to abolish patriotism and internationalise the native patrimony is thus equivalent to the endeavour to repress the sexual impulse: in both cases the instinctive drive breaks forth in perverted activities. This is probably the *basis* of the mounting crime and student and other protests—which, senseless and destructive as they appear, and incited and exploited by Communist conspiracy as they are, yet are the only outlet for an inborn will-to-freedom and to property which are being denied by the mounting repression of government and technology*.

*For a close analysis of this situation, see *American Moral Ambiguity*. The Massey Lectures for 1966 (CBC) by Dr. Paul Goodman.

The internationalist endeavour to extirpate patriotism and abolish private property has been proved to be a Conspiracy, most readily recognised now in its manifestation as International Communism. But it is probably just because it goes against the grain of fundamental human nature (whatever its attractions to perverted seekers after power) that Douglas said that the Conspiracy had no hope of ultimate success, although it had a high chance of setting back civilisation by hundreds of years. Already it has accomplished the death or slavery of millions, and the brainwashing of millions more. Since Douglas wrote, the technological means to increase the power of central governments have expanded almost geometrically so that the advance towards Orwell's *1984* is visible; and beyond that to Huxley's *Brave New World* only less so.

In this context, it is worth recalling what Douglas wrote in 1924 in *Social Credit* (Part III, Chapter III): “. . . the break-up of the present financial and social system is certain . . . the only point at issue is the length of time which the break-up will take, and the tribulations we have to undergo while the break-up is in progress. . . . There will probably come well within the lives of the present generation, a period at which the blind forces of destruction will appear to be in the ascendant. . . .

“There is, at the moment, no party, group or individual possessing at once 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 on the part of the so-called Conservative elements in Society, elements which themselves seem incapable, or undesirous of genuine initiative; a process which can only result, like all rearguard actions, in a successive, if not successful, retreat on the part of the forces attacked. While this process is alone active, there seems to be no sound ground for optimism; but it is difficult to believe that the whole world is so bereft of sanity that a pause for reflection is too much to hope for, pending a final resignation to utter catastrophe.”

Few people would have agreed with that forecast in 1924; but making allowance for the emergence of obvious Conspiracy, and the fantastic technological developments of the intervening years, 1968 sees its high near fulfilment. The only question now is: have we got a pause for reflection, or are we consigned to utter catastrophe?

It is *possible* that we have a pause. If we have, we have an opportunity. To take advantage of that opportunity requires definite exertion and expert navigation by that minority which recognises the true nature and profound gravity of the situation, if we are to survive the cataract which must now be run (*op. cit.*).

(June 1, 1968.)

* * *

In its issue for May 17, 1968, the *Spectator* (itself one of the more conspicuous exemplars of punditry in the political commentary industry), quotes under the heading “The perils of punditry” the following: “Six years ago things were totally different. Paris was like a city under siege. . . . There were endless demonstrations . . . they often ended in violence. . . . The change since then has been dramatic. All those dreadful memories have vanished from the public mind.” The source given is: “From ‘France: stable, prosperous and infuriating’ by Patrick Brogan in *The Times*, May 6.”

When de Gaulle was brought back to power in 1958, France was steadily moving towards chaos, and the situation in Algeria was becoming critical. The French Army at that time was patriotic, and by sheer

experience, thoroughly and efficiently anti-Communist. This state of affairs was dangerous to the Communists, as it implied at least the possibility of the military taking over the French Government, and putting an end to terrorism in Algeria as well as restoring firm government in France itself. That is to say, from the Communist point of view the situation in France was at least potentially 'counter-revolutionary'. To meet this threat, de Gaulle, whose previous tenure of office was distinguished by collaboration with the Communists, was brought back to unprecedented power, under the promise that "Algeria is a French land, organically today *and forever*" (added emphasis). This is one of those memories which "have vanished from the public mind".

The Algerians at that time regarded themselves as part of France; and there was a large community of Frenchmen among them. But de Gaulle betrayed both communities, finally handing Algeria over to the Communist led FLN under the guise of granting independence. This was done "in such manner as to confuse, weaken, and render almost helpless, all effective opposition in Metropolitan France itself to a gradual Communist takeover of that country".

As well as this, de Gaulle proceeded with the destruction of the French army as an effective anti-Communist organisation, in the main "by wholesale transfers and rotations of officers, in a specific pattern of systematically breaking up all cliques and groupings of such officers who had shown strong patriotic feelings about protecting Algeria and keeping it French".

A careful summary history of the betrayal of Algeria, the destruction of the French army as a potential opposition to the gradual Communisation of France, and of the execution or prolonged imprisonment of enemies of de Gaulle's policies is contained in *The Tragedy of France; an American Opinion* reprint, from which the above quotations are taken. Without knowledge of what went on in the eight years following de Gaulle's return to power, it is hardly possible to understand the deadly significance of the present anarchy in France.

Once Algeria had been delivered to the Communists, the public memory of the events (highly distorted in their reporting by the mass media) was smothered, and a picture of de Gaulle as a super if somewhat egocentric patriot was built up. This image distracted attention from the realities of French (i.e., de Gaulle's) policies of pro-Communism, anti-Americanism, and the effective dismantling of NATO. All these things, quite apparent in their accomplishment, were minimised or explained away by the political commentary industry as just eccentricities of the 'unpredictable' Grand Old Man of France. Nothing mattered but that he had saved France from anarchy, and was to be forgiven anything for having created a "stable and prosperous France". The truth was, however, that the time was not yet ripe for the open Communisation of France as the opening move in the final stage in the conquest and enslavement of mankind.

In the immediate post-war years, Western Europe was confronted by massive Red Armies in occupation of 'Eastern' Europe, apparently poised for a march to the Atlantic. This situation was dramatised by Winston Churchill, after consultation with the late Bernard Baruch and Mr. James Byrne, in his resounding Fulton speech in the U.S.A., when he declared the existence of an Iron Curtain across Europe*.

*See *The State of the World* (Tidal Publications); "East Europe" by Medford Evans (T.S.C., Aug. 26, Sept. 9, Sept. 23, Oct. 21, 1967).

To meet this apparently purely military threat, the North Atlantic Treaty Organisation—NATO—was brought into being. But the purely military threat was a Communist feint. The almost sole mechanism of Communist advance is by penetration, subversion, perversion, and corruption of the traditional moral and institutional pillars of Western Christian civilisation.

The major premise of NATO was the strategic and logistic capability of the U.S.A. and above all the 'nuclear umbrella'.

The military posture of the Red armies, however, served to distract attention from internal Communist penetration. And as this penetration—indeed, covert control—succeeded in France, NATO at France's insistence shifted its stores and dismantled its logistic lines of communication. That is the strategic background against which France's sudden wave of anarchy must be viewed.

The anarchy undoubtedly arises out of a general dissatisfaction with life under modern industrial conditions—conditions which are the inevitable outcome of *persistence* in a defective financial system. The Communists—and even more, the international financial group behind Communism—knew that this time must come, and that by destroying all forces to the right of the Communists, they would be the only group organised to impose order, through force and terror, on a chaotic society.

It must be obvious to everyone except professional economists that wage increases, which enter into subsequent prices and increase them, are only a very temporary palliative to the workers, whereas the inflation which results from this (and other) causes is the ruin of those on fixed incomes. So the demands for higher wages is not the significant feature of the present French crisis. The significant feature, and that which distinguishes this as the final crisis, is the demands of (or via) the Trades Unions for worker participation in *management* of industry.

The management of industry is necessarily hierarchical, and is no more susceptible to worker participation than the conduct of a cricket match is susceptible to ‘democratic’ procedures. So clearly this ‘demand’ conceals some other objective; and if it is conceded, we shall have the final proof that the rule of Communism is to be made overt.

What is concealed is the demand for the formation of soviets in industry—i.e., councils of workers ‘elected’ by workers. This is the classical method by which Communist control is finally clamped on the community. And since ‘the workers’ would now ‘control’ industry, strikes would become counter-revolutionary. It is at this point that the terror begins.

The industrial soviets, even if elected, would be dominated by Communist Party members; any recalcitrant ‘elected’ workers would soon be purged, through the well- tried Communist technique of Party discipline—denunciations, Peoples’ Courts, etc.*

*See *From Colonialism to Communism* by Hoang Van Chi (Popular Library Inc., New York).

It is quite obvious that in this situation, and with or without NATO, the U.S.A. could not intervene—certainly *would* not, for some of the main Conspirators effectively control the U.S.A. Administration. And also, the U.S.A. has troubles of its own.

But the Red Armies could intervene. That is what they are for. Germany could not move, but, squeezed between Communist East Europe and Communist France, would succumb, and with it, the rest of Europe. Khrushchev *meant* that “We will bury you”.

All this makes plain the meaning of de Gaulle’s demand for a referendum to confirm him in emergency powers to carry out ‘reforms’. If ‘the people’ vote for them, then they become ‘legal’. A referendum, particularly held under threat of civil war, thus becomes like an election in Communist run countries—a vote for a single list of pre-selected candidates.

A favourite product of the political commentary industry has been speculation as to what will happen when the old man de Gaulle dies. Perhaps now the speculation should be how far the European Economic Council was merely preparation for the Communist integration of the Union of European Soviet States.

(June 15, 1968.)

* * *

The June 1968 *Bulletin* of the John Birch Society estimates “from a synthesis of assorted and extensive information, including some professional polls of industry”, that twenty to twenty-five percent of the American people are now aware of the reality of the Communist conspiracy. It highlights this achievement in exposure of the roots of our troubles by contrasting it with the situation in Britain. “In less than one generation the Communists, and the *Insiders* above them, have succeeded in dismantling the British empire, in turning the colonial peoples to whom Britain owed protection over to the cruelty of Communist tyrants, in reducing the United Kingdom itself to a bankrupt third- rate nation, and in destroying at least half of all the time-honoured freedoms of the British people.

“All of these steps towards and into the ultimate horror of slavery under Communism have been carried out by blatant and deliberate treason, disguised as idealism, reform, opportunism, or stupidity. . . . Yet there is no real awakening or awareness among the British people as to what is happening to them, or why. You can read the British press daily, on every subject from the Communist riots in Hong Kong to the effect of the American ‘dollar crisis’ on the British budget, without getting the slightest suspicion that any such thing as the Communist conspiracy even exists.”

That this observation is true may be verified by anyone who will bear it in mind when reading or listening to the mass media. References are made from time to time to Russia as a potential *military* threat; but never to the Red Army as the potential *police force* to support revolutionary governments emerging from the chaos which financial manipulation, Fabian subversion, and Communist Party disruption are steadily promoting.

When the late C. H. Douglas, during the First World War, penetrated the mystery then surrounding the operation of the financial system, he foresaw that, if unmodified, it must lead to a world government supported by force, and that the greatest barrier to such a culmination was the existence of the British Empire. In those early days of Social Credit history, Douglas characterised Communism and Socialism as “crudities”, and considered it possible that international financial power was unconscious of its destination. The unfolding of events soon enough ruled out that possibility, and he arrived at and exposed the interlocking nature of International Finance, Fabian Socialism, and International Communism, and denounced the *treason* which was accomplishing the destruction of the British Empire.

In Britain, as elsewhere, all political parties are infested with traitors; but in Britain they are most conspicuous in the Labour Party. Being conspicuous, however, does not mean being more dangerous—perhaps the reverse; so there is no hope—again, perhaps the reverse—in a mere change of government if this means only a shuffle of Parties. What is required is *impeachment of identified traitors* before a properly constituted tribunal.

In principle, the conditions in Britain are those which would have been imposed by a victorious Germany. The sanction by which they have been imposed is financial rather than military, though the threat of a Third World War has been skilfully deployed as a backing.

(June 29, 1968.)

* * *

It is supremely important to dispel the myth, ever more sedulously promoted, that the fearful crisis now upon us is the result, in Britain in particular, of the ‘mess’ left by the Conservatives compounded by the ‘incompetence’ of the Labour Government. The roots lie in *conscious intention* extending well back before the First World War—which, indeed, was part of that same conscious intention*. An excerpt from a letter by President Woodrow Wilson to Colonel House† (an arch-conspirator who dominated the President—see *Fabian Freeway* by Rose L. Martin) makes the situation plain enough. House had written to the President with a suggestion that the *Berliner Tageblatt* and the New York *World* should each present the respective views of the Allies and the Central Powers. Wilson replied: “Frankly, I see some very grave possibilities of danger in your plan for an interchange of views about peace between the *World* and the *Tageblatt*, particularly if Northcliffe and Tardieu are to be made counsellors in the matter. England and France have not the same views with regard to peace that we have by any means. When the war is over we can force them to our way of thinking, because by that time they will, among other things, be financially in our hands; but we cannot force them now, and any attempt to speak for them or to speak our common mind would bring on disagreements which would inevitably come to the surface in public and rob the whole thing of its effect. I saw this all too plainly in a conversation with Viviani. If there is to be an interchange of views at all, it ought to be between us and the liberals in Germany, with no one else brought in.

*See C. H. Douglas: *The Big Idea; 'Programme for the Third World War; The Brief for the Prosecution.*

†Woodrow Wilson: *Life and Letters* by Ray S. Baker: Doubleday, Doran & Co., Inc. New York, 1939.

“Even at that, how is the State Department, or any other official agency of the Government, going to ask

that the *Tageblatt* be allowed to print what the *World* says without any interference by the censor without its appearing that what is proposed is *really* [emphasis added] an interchange of views between the German liberals [the German progenitors of Fabianism] and this Government? I do not think it possible to keep the hand of the Administration concealed. [The Hidden Hand.]

“It seems to me that these are very real difficulties and disclose some deep dangers. Our *real* peace terms [emphasis added]—those upon which we shall undoubtedly insist—are not now acceptable to either France or Italy (leaving Great Britain for the moment out of consideration).

“.....

Your *grateful* Friend [emphasis added]
WOODROW WILSON.”

“We”? “Our”?

The First World War was preceded by the formation of the American Federal Reserve Board under *German-Jewish* auspices (the Warburgs, etc.), and it was this instrumentality which brought the Allies “among other things” financially into ‘our’ hands. The ‘real’ peace terms were then negotiated between, *inter alia*, the brothers Warburg, one for America and one for Germany. The Versailles Treaty prepared the ground for the Second World War and the advance of International Communism, hitherto confined to the USSR, and accomplished in the next twenty years the destruction of the British Empire as *the* essential step to the formation of World Government.

This is the background to the Party politics which now more than ever bedevil the British people, well on their way to final enslavement. The only way to a still faintly possible redemption is to expose and challenge the agents and agencies which have brought about the present catastrophe. The immense economic strength of South Africa (consciously opposed to the Communist Conspiracy), Britain, Australia, New Zealand, Rhodesia (again consciously anti-Conspiracy) and Canada could sustain the necessary challenge, given a realistic monetary system. But Europe is on the brink, and its collapse might bring down Britain, so there is but a limited time in which to bring home to those patriotic Members of Parliament who can be identified the pressures they must put on the Wilson cabal, whose policies so exactly conform to the Conspiracy’s objectives in Britain, in Rhodesia and, perhaps most disgracefully of all, in Nigeria.

(June 29, 1968.)

* * *

There has been some correspondence recently in the London press concerning Neville Chamberlain’s role in the Munich crisis. But the event of Munich itself is the matter of crucial importance. Prior to Munich, the British Socialists were pacifists, an attitude which was largely responsible for allowing the re-armament of Germany (financed by the Bank ‘of England’) to proceed to a point where either the capitulation of Britain or war with Germany was inevitable. The Socialists in this, as always, were obeying their internationalist master’s voice, in the main proceeding from Washington. After Munich, and almost with the celerity with which subsequently Soviet Russia signed a non-aggression pact with Germany, the Socialists began to howl for war.

Unfortunately, but quite naturally, contemporary society is more and more composed of new generations whose direct knowledge of the immediate pre-war period is either hazy, or entirely the result of hearsay. It is this passing of the generations which is one of the mainstays of the apparently inexorable progress of International Socialism, for whose advance the two stages of the World War were fought*. Since the conclusion of the Second stage the pseudo-sciences of Social Studies and Politics have steadily brainwashed the oncoming generations in the theories of Fabian Socialism, and it is this as much as the persistence in a defective financial system which underlies the present student disorders. (Mr. Enoch Powell, as reported in the *Sunday Telegraph* of June 23, 1968, wisely remarked of student disorders: “The most striking and objectionable feature of current indiscipline in universities and colleges has been not merely the connivance, but the actual participation of staff in breaches of order by their own set of students”.)

*For an analysis of the origin of the First phase see the article “Central Europe” by Medford Evans in *American Opinion*, July/August, 1968.

Thus Munich for practical purposes marks the emergence into the open of ultimate Socialist policy, epitomised in the Fabian Political and Economic Planning (P.E.P.) statement: “Only in war or under threat of war will any British government embark on large-scale planning.”

(July 13, 1968.)

* * *

The failure of the mass media to convince the public that their present plight is due to Mr. Wilson’s ineptitude is revealed in a *Sunday Times* opinion poll (June 23, 1968), where of those sampled, 91% rated him as intelligent, 82% as clever, and 66% as capable. On the other hand, 52% said that they do not believe him when he says something, as against 35% who do; and 49% put from “all” to “quite a lot” of the blame for the Government’s deteriorating position on him.

The idea, which Mr. Desmond Donnelly seems to share (*News of the World*, June 23, 1968) that this intelligent, clever, capable man believes that his “panaceas for solving all Britain’s economic problems” will restore Britain’s position in the world will not hold water. What Mr. Wilson is after is a *different position*—a bureaucratically controlled Britain integrated into a One World Order. The essential step towards ‘interdependence’ is the destruction of independence, as in Katanga and Biafra; and, if possible, in Rhodesia too. Mr. Wilson’s cabal has been contributing arms for the slaughter and starvation of probably over 100,000 Ibos (Standford and Thomas, *News of the World*, June 23, 1968). News of the horrors in Nigeria has only quite recently become public knowledge; but the British Government must have known what was going on. Behind it all—the destructive economic policies in Britain; trading with Russia which supplies the arms which are slaughtering the Vietnamese; the tacit encouragement of violence in Rhodesia— lies the terrible calculation that the peoples of these generations are expendable in the service of an ‘ideal’ One World of the future.

(July 13, 1968.)

* * *

There appears to be an almost frantic haste to consolidate the monopoly of nuclear weapons in the hands of the U.S.A. and the USSR—as a prelude, without doubt, to an agreement to hand over their control to the U.N. Mr. George Ball, former U.S. Under-Secretary of State, and now U.S. Ambassador to the U.N., proposes* that the U.S. should ‘purchase’ (i.e., reduce slightly Britain’s unrepayable debt) Britain’s Polaris submarines and the stockpile of H-bombs and warheads. The genealogy of the proposal is clearly traceable back to the Nassau (1962) agreement when the Sky-bolt air-to-ground missile, around which the British had revised their defence plans, was abruptly abandoned by the U.S., and Britain was offered Polaris missiles, to be committed to NATO, but otherwise to be available for the defence of Britain only in “supreme national interests”—as defined, no doubt, by the U.S.

**The Discipline of Power*: Bodley Head, 35s. Reviewed by Chapman Pincher, *Daily Express*, June 20, 1968.

The Nassau ‘agreement’ was sprung on a ‘Conservative’ Administration, and even so stirred misgivings in Britain. But the Socialists are opposed to “supreme national interests” and in favour of an international police force which could, for example, subject (temporarily) Southern Africa to black majority rule—by ultimatum, if it possessed the monopoly of nuclear power.

For the (probably short) present, the now visible final steps towards the consolidation of World Power are being taken under the sanction of finance—international indebtedness. A military challenge to the Power operating through Finance is quite evidently now impossible; but a military defence of a reformed financial system might just possibly be sustained, because there is a moral basis for reform. The *reality* concealed behind financial mumbo-jumbo is that there is only one way by which Britain, *inter alia*, can discharge her debts—**BY THE DELIVERY OF REAL GOODS AND SERVICES**. Absolutely nothing can be done which does not proceed from a recognition of this reality, which exposes the fact that international *financial* indebtedness is simply an instrument of international coercion. Thus Britain, for example, might offer to deliver free to the holders of her external debts a given percentage of her total physical production (which

could be greatly expanded under suitable financial arrangements) in exchange for a writing off of the debts. This is in fact what happens (so far as it does happen); but to bring the fact into the open would expose the moral issue. And the issue is simply to do this, or finally to surrender to World Government—the objective of the traitors in the British Government.

(July 13, 1968.)

* * *

General de Gaulle has been reported as saying: “Thanks to me, Communism will come to France without revolution’. It has come. Communism means the total subjection of the individual to the State. The most recent, and probably the best, description of its *modus operandi* in its crudest the most fundamental form is given in Hoang Van Chi’s *From Colonialism to Communism**, an eye-witness account of the communisation of North Vietnam through economic levelling, terrorisation, and “land reform”.

*Popular Library Inc., New York.

Probably not even a certificated economist would believe that the wage increases ‘granted’ to the French workers can be ‘absorbed’ by French industry—i.e., not result in a rise in prices, making French goods ‘non-competitive’ in world markets. In fact, the increases are to be met by soaking ‘the rich’—a process of levelling which is progressive until *all* economic power is transferred from individuals to the State. As this programme becomes effective, resistance (called by Communists counter-revolution) is likely to become apparent; de Gaulle has announced that public disorder will not be tolerated.

(July 27, 1968.)

* * *

From a global point of view, the ‘under-developed’ areas of the world are to the ‘developed’ what Siberia is to Russia—a potential slave-labour camp for counter-revolutionaries. Accomplished industrialisation, with its promise of leisure and freedom on an ever-increasing scale, is the most serious threat to total power and total government. But global development offers the Conspiracy unlimited opportunity of providing ‘employment’ (slavery) for all well into the foreseeable future. That this ‘development’ is unrelated to the well-being of the present inhabitants of the undeveloped areas is displayed in its ghastly reality by the complicity of the Wilson cabal in the starvation of the Ibos of Biafra and its incitement to violence in Rhodesia.

There is very little visible hope left of averting impending disaster; what hope there is, lies in facing the reality behind our troubles, and confronting those responsible at any level. Wilson and Co. are no whit less responsible for the descent of civilisation into catastrophe than was Hitler. They are theorists to whom, as Douglas said, “misery and death of millions is a grain of sand beside the working out of their designs”. In the long run, of course, Wilson also is a grain of sand; but in the meantime, for ulterior purposes, he has damaged the British economy, deprived thousands of their normal livelihood, and created a dangerous situation in Rhodesia. Wilson is much too clever to be shielded by the injunction: “Father, forgive them, for they know not what they do”. Wilson knows and, worse, enjoys what he does.

(July 21, 1968.)

* * *

Writing under the heading “Family banning” in *Spectator*, July 12, 1968, J. W. M. Thompson observes: “It took 200,000 years for man to reach his first thousand million, but only a hundred to reach his second; the signs are that the world’s present population is likely to be doubled again before the end of the century, and probably quadrupled before today’s children are dead. No one can foresee all the implications of this, but there is small reason to think they will be anything but menacing to the species.”

Yet in 1798 John Thomas Malthus published his *Essay on the Principle of Population as It Affects the Future of Mankind*. The “Principle”, to be understood in the general rather than the strictly mathematical sense, is that population grows in a geometrical ratio, while means of subsistence grow only in an arithmetical ratio. This principle, at times derided, is that which underlies the now much-publicised

“population explosion”. Now supposing others besides Malthus, and perhaps even before him, observed this principle; who is to say that they did not foresee at least the more obvious implications “to the species”? And what species?

From a purely biological point of view ‘mankind’ is regarded as a species within the Order of the Mammals, and within this species there is, by definition, no reproductive isolation. But for reasons explored by Dr. B. W. Monahan in an essay (*The Aims of Education**) in 1944, the biological classification of mankind is not adequate to the human situation. Put shortly, biological speciation has been overtaken by what might be called “cultural speciation”; that is to say, what differentiates one ‘people’ from another is not the set of physical characteristics which can be classified biologically, but the cultural characteristics which are acquired *after birth* and therefore lie outside the genetic mechanism. The important thing which leads individuals to cohere as ‘a people’ is much less racial than cultural; but once there is cohesion as a group, the aim of *survival as a group* emerges, and one of the components of that aim is foresightedness.

*Tidal Publications, Sydney, and K.R.P. Publications Ltd., London.

Thus if Malthus and Mr. Thompson, *et al.*, are right, the problem is not that of the survival of the species as a biological whole, but of what culturally differentiated group has foreseen the problem and taken steps towards its own survival.

From this point of view, the prospect is terrifying. Depopulation *as a conscious policy* emerged in the eighteenth century French revolutions, and re-emerged with the Communist revolution in Russia, China, and elsewhere, and is current in Africa. ‘Decolonisation’ is depopulation on the do-it-yourself principle—currently on view in Nigeria, with the Nigerian Federal Government, Russia and the Wilson cabal as co-producers.

‘Racial’ tensions and conflicts are quite obviously incited and sustained by propaganda, and serve to distract attention from the real conflict in the world, which is cultural. Communism, of course, is not a culture; it is the vehicle for the survival-policy of those ultimately behind it.

The evidence is overwhelming that behind Communist and associated evils there is a self-conscious elite, surviving by appointing its own successors (initiates), using war and revolution to keep the population ‘explosion’ at bay until its own power, and hence its survival, is unchallengeable. The attack on religion, morality and the mores of peoples presages what the future holds.

(Aug. 10, 1968.)

* * *

Merely to dispose of the accelerating output of the modern industrial economy means that the ‘standard of living’ must rise, a fact which would most accurately be reflected by a falling price-level. The attempt to reflect it by raising wages and salaries in fact distorts it, for these increases subsequently appear in increased costs and hence increased prices. This inherently vicious circle underlies industrial strife and increasing crime, both exploited by Communism.

The cost-structure of industry, reflected in prices, is the product of a system of accountancy which ensures a rising price level. It is quite definitely so that a differing system of accountancy could ensure a falling price-level. Now even if all wages and salaries were frozen, a falling price-level, related to the increasing productivity of the industrial system, would ensure that the community became steadily ‘richer’. A falling price-level means an increasing purchasing power, and put in this form it becomes obvious to inspection, so to speak, that a given human effort increases its purchase because it is multiplied by the power of the machine and improvement in design.

There is no doubt that this state of affairs is perfectly well known on the one hand to those ultimately in control of the monetary system which, to them, is the present mechanism of World Government; and on the other hand to the Communist Party to whom industrial strife arising from falling purchasing power is the motive power of subversion. But of course, control of finance and control of Communism are concentric.

(Aug. 10, 1968.)

* * *

In broad terms, food consists of two main components, the body-building, and the energy-providing. The former consists of protein (animal meat, and some constituents of grains and other vegetable matter) and minerals; the latter of carbohydrates—starch and sugar. Proteins and minerals are of the highest importance in the period of growth, for if deficient, even with plentiful carbohydrate, normal growth cannot occur. Protein shortage in infants and young children gives rise to a disease characterised by retarded growth and development, skin disorders, mental retardation and apathy. This disease, some effects of which are irreversible after a sufficient length of time, is called Kwashiorkor. In Biafra they call it Wilson's Disease. (Anthony Haden-Guest, London *Daily Telegraph*, July 17, 1968.)

“It is, in fact, doubtful if the full extent of Britain's unpopularity is yet recognised in London. ‘Do you know what we call a liar in Biafra?’ asks Nonyem, a pretty Biafran girl, an ex-teacher, ‘A BBC man...’”

And yet there are those, including clergy, who contemplate with satisfaction the possibility that conditions may arise which will lead to Wilson's disease becoming rampant in Rhodesia. Truly, the British people knew not what they did when they elected the Wilson cabal to power.

(Aug. 10, 1968.)

* * *

Rather surprisingly, Peter Simple II (London *Daily Telegraph*, July 30, 1968) suggests that “the young” have nothing more to contribute to the political discussions of their time than “mindless slogans”. It is very likely true that the young make their contributions *mindlessly*; but slogans, so far from being mindless, are a concentrated manifestation of the power of the mind, and political dynamite. Slogans can be for good or for evil purposes; but this is a period where slogans carefully conceived by evil minds are playing a literally vital role in the most intense and deadly attack on spiritual civilisation in the whole of history; for slogans are perhaps indispensable in the formation and cohesion of mobs.

A mob, as has often been observed, has its own particular psychology, whose main feature is probably suggestibility—a near hypnotic condition of mind which will accept uncritically ideas normally repugnant to belief. But these ideas, once accepted, thereafter lead a life of their own, and generate *in the individual* activities which would otherwise hardly have been contemplated.

The slogan “God is dead” has been *seen* to activate agnostics into participation in attacks on the institutions of religion. “Make Love not War” (and particularly its pornographic and obscene expressions) has metamorphosed into promiscuity and gross promiscuity, a potent solvent of personal responsibility and patriotism. “Black Power” and “Student Power” have erupted in violence, murder and arson; theft, looting and destruction. The cry “Police Brutality” has intimidated the forces of law and order and been accompanied by a growth in the crime rate greatly exceeding the rate of increase of the population.

The very universality of slogans and the international synchronisation of ‘protest’, demonstrations and strikes points unmistakably to an international conspiracy, whose pervasive power is borne witness to by the virtual complicity of the mass media in the provocation of destruction and paralysis of reaction to the forces visibly destroying the foundations of our society. These media too propagate the ‘liberal’ slogans of internationalism—mass terrorisation by the threat of annihilating atomic warfare (“Better Red than Dead”); the ‘mellowing’ of Communism and its growing ‘compatibility’ with an increasingly socialised ‘Capitalism’. And there is the unbroken conspiracy of silence concerning the central part played in all this by the international Financial Power.

For there *are* solid grounds for protest, arising from the shortage of purchasing-power *relative* to the swelling evidence of potential abundance for all in the industrialised nations. What should be purchasing-power in the hands of *individuals* is accumulated in the executives of *institutions*, resulting in a senseless proliferation of office buildings which are mainly daylight prisons for hordes engaged in form-filling; and a grossly expanding industry whose product is increasingly ‘for export’. All this is the consequence of financial *policy*, which aims at keeping the population ‘employed’ as a means of government, regardless of

whether the product, or none, of 'employment' fulfils the genuine needs of individuals.

And equally there are grounds for feelings of frustration as a result of an educational system distorted in the interests of technology, increasingly turning out specialists surplus to the requirements of a computerised and automated production system, and untrained in other occupations offering remuneration commensurate with their redundant specialist qualifications.

But the protests and frustrations are aggravated, distorted, and exploited; and restless young intellectuals are fed with the doctrines of subversion, resulting in an outpouring of books of pornography and destruction. Thus George Steiner (*Guardian* July 21, 1968) quotes Raoul Vaneigem (*Traite de savoir-vivre a l'usage des jeunes generations*): "We must destroy the enemy, not judge him . . . We know that there will be no one left to judge us, that judges shall be forever absent, for we shall have devoured them". And Steiner remarks that Vaneigem is right in believing that there will be "no overthrow until language itself is made new, until speech as we know and use it ceases".

(Aug. 24, 1968.)

* * *

The Daily Telegraph, London, July 22, 1968, reports Mr. Pieter Botha, the South African Defence Minister, as saying that guerilla attacks in Rhodesia, Angola and Mozambique were aimed ultimately at South Africa. "At the moment we are threatened by unconventional warfare, but if terrorism should succeed, a greater, conventional threat will tax our powers."

But even this does not see into the situation deeply enough. The constant and mounting threat of guerrilla activity is likely to gradually raise the political temperature of the whole area, until a point may be reached where spontaneous combustion occurs in the form of outbreaks of terrorism—the objective of the outside pressures and incitements directed particularly against Rhodesia. As things are developing in the world, there is a point of no return for South Africa along this road. If it is not anticipated by an act of initiative consciously directed against the international forces, South Africa will be faced by massacre or surrender.

(Aug. 24, 1968.)

* * *

Mr. Diederichs, the South African Minister of Finance, is reported (*South African Digest*, July 26, 1968) as saying: "I find it incomprehensible that the United States and certain other countries . . . should now wish to force South Africa to sell its gold on the free market by attempting to prevent it selling to monetary authorities . . .

"This reversal of policy must lead to a weakening rather than to a strengthening of the international monetary structure as well as to a total loss of confidence."

The Minister poses, by implication, the wrong question. The real and urgent question is: "In what context does the policy of reversing a policy make sense?" Surely Mr. Diederichs does not believe that he knows more of the operations of international finance than 'the United States'—*i.e.*, those responsible for the monetary policy followed by the United States and "certain other countries"? A first assumption in matters of this kind must be that the 'authorities' *intend* the consequences of their actions rather than that they have reached their eminent positions without being able to foresee those consequences.

Mr. Diederichs and other members of the South African Government know very well what would be the consequences of handing over government in South Africa to "black majority" rule. Yet 'world opinion' is *directed* towards this objective. They know the importance of the Cape route to international commerce; yet the 'British' Government refuses to supply arms for its defence. Whether they realise that the Republic of South Africa is, *for the present*, the one remaining country which could perhaps successfully challenge the emerging World Government is a more open question.

Supposing there is a "total loss of confidence" leading to a universal economic crisis? Supposing the

United States, the headquarters of International Finance, and Russia, logistically prepared and strategically placed by its Middle East and North African dispositions to take over Europe in the event of an economic crisis, agreed to set up a World Government of the United Nations “to avert nuclear war”?

Control of the *whole* of Africa is essential to effective World Government; and, in the face of the population explosion, so is de-population. The Republic of South Africa stands in the way.

The visible destruction of spiritual civilisation *may* be due to incomprehensible foolishness on the part of those in the seats of highest power. But it may more probably be due to a perfectly comprehensible long-sighted knavery which, if not frustrated while there is time, will surely engulf the Republic of South Africa.

(Aug. 24, 1968.)

* * *

The Satanic ruthlessness of the drive for World Government is perhaps only apparent in perspective, and some of its manifestations become forgotten. Thus *Human Events* (July 13, 1968) reprints an article from the Chicago *Tribune* which recalls the use of slave labour after the end of World War II, the forced repatriation of Russians rounded up after the defeat of Germany, and the mass expulsion of Germans from their ancestral homes in Eastern and East Central Europe. Yet who nowadays is *aware* of all this?

“Some 900,000 anti-Communist Russians were shipped home from Germany after the war, with the certain prospect of becoming inmates of slave labour camps or facing a firing squad. President Franklin Roosevelt and Prime Minister Churchill of Britain countenanced this operation at Yalta.*

*Code name: Operation Keelhaul—Ed. T.S.C.

“They also agreed with the Soviet dictator, Josef Stalin, that Russia was to have ‘the use of German labour’ as a form of reparations. In deference to their own sensibilities, the two Western humanitarians buried the provision in a secret protocol.

“The stipulation that the Western powers were to hand back to Stalin his runaway subjects placed American and British military authorities in the role of slave catchers, rounding up refugees from Soviet tyranny.

“Hundreds of thousands of German soldiers taken prisoner after their country was defeated were transported to forced labour in the Soviet Union. Years after the end of the war broken survivors were still coming home to Germany. Britain and France also availed themselves of German forced labour. The British had at least 500,000 prisoners at work for them, and a third of these had been supplied from United States and Canadian prisoner-of-war camps.

“Equally savage was the fate of the Great Germans who had been living for hundreds of years in Poland, Czechoslovakia and Hungary, as well as the Germans of East Prussia, parceled out at Yalta to Poland and the Soviet Union, and of Eastern Germany, handed over to Poland.

“It has been estimated that 18 million Germans were forced out of their homes and set on the road westward. More than two million men, women and children are believed to have died in the expulsion. . .”

The liquidations and purges in Russia in the 1920’s, the current chaos in Africa, American supplies to the U.S.S.R. enabling the Russians to supply the North Vietnamese to prolong a war which could have been terminated years ago—all belong to the one perspective of horror, to which there is no end yet in sight.

(Aug. 24, 1968.)

* * *

“The young have two handicaps: time (they grow older by the minute) and their own good faith. Had anyone foretold in 1945 that Salazar, Franco and de Gaulle would be in power almost a quarter of a century later, that socialism in England would faithfully support a Vietnam war and shuffle along on the sufferance

of the international money market, that millions would be on the brink of starvation due to lunatic tribal warfare, he would have been deemed a sinister crank. The young always underestimate the cunning, the rapacity, the sheer staying power of the old. They never understand how deeply their dreamt-of tomorrows are already mortgaged to cruel, insoluble yesterdays.”

—*Sunday Times*, London, July 21, 1968.

1945? The late C. H. Douglas foretold from the early 1920’s onwards (see *T.S.C.*, June 29 and July 27, 1968, for example), in necessarily generalised terms, just the developments summarised by the *Sunday Times*. Following the renewed outbreak of war in 1939, his warnings grew ever more specific, epitomised in his statements: “They [the international money marketeers] care no more for the immolation of the peoples of a continent than for the death of a sparrow”; and “unfortunately the world is in the grasp of theorists to whom misery and death of millions is a grain of sand beside the working out of their designs”.

The *Sunday Times* article is discussing the student mutinies which for some years now have increasingly swept the world, and notes *inter alia* the part played by the breakdown of sexual morality: “I believe that this liberation at the core has released enormous psychic energies. That it has created a gap of understanding between young and old, a failure of shared reference deeper than any we have known in recent history.” But, characteristically, the *Sunday Times* does not tell us, what can be confirmed from Communist textbooks, that conspirators planned to ‘liberate’ sexuality from morality, long before Communism became manifest as a force in history. Stormer’s *None Dare Call It Treason* reveals quite plainly the planned progress of the ‘permissive’ society. While it is true that probably almost all the students are motivated ideologically by frustrated hopes and idealism and driven by an unrestrained sexuality, the frustration and the amorality are the product of a planned unbridled industrialism coupled with a centralised monetary control which turns mounting disorder to the advantage of the international monetary marketeers; while the demonstrations of the students are so obviously manipulated and coordinated that it is a miracle of hypnotism that more people do not see it to be so.

Unprecedented sabotage of production (largely in the form of grossly misdirected effort) conceals the world of leisure and plenty which could so easily be our lot and which is our rightful heritage—a heritage in which cultivated idealism, good manners and artistic endeavour would make protest undreamed of.*

(Aug. 24, 1968.)

*See ‘*Neither Do They Spin*’... by Bryan W. Monahan: Tidal Publications, Sydney, and K.R.P. Publications Ltd., London.

* * *

To raise the question what is happening in and about Czechoslovakia is like asking what a move on the chessboard means. “Why all this display of military might?” asks the *Daily Express* (Aug. 22, 1968); and answers: “The truth is that the Soviet leaders are afraid, are scared stiff— not of bombs, but of ideas”.

The Czechoslovak ‘crisis’ is a move in the deadly ‘game’ which, after centuries of development, is visibly moving towards its culmination. The prize is World Government. The contestants are on the one hand a self-perpetuating conspiratorial group aiming at a rigidly controlled centrally directed organisation of the population of the globe; on the other the organically evolving civilizations having their foundations in individual families sustained by religions, traditions, and beliefs.

To identify Communism with Russia as a military power confuses the reality. Since the 1917 revolution in Russia was not nipped in the bud, Communism in Russia has been financed from the U.S.A., and never more so than during and subsequent to World War ‘II’. Since World War ‘II’, there has never been a time when Russia was under military threat. The reverse is the truth. It is Russia which proclaims that Communism will take over the whole world—peacefully, if possible, but with sufficient military power to impose Communist ‘peace’.

A few quiet words behind closed doors about Czechoslovakia’s economic realities would suffice to keep her in line. Why then this super-colossal all-star production? Because at all costs the West must see ‘Russia’ as a military power under threat by China, and barely able to keep its own house and

neighbourhood in order, instead of, as it is, the military component of bipolar international conspiracy, of which the other pole is internationally centralised money power.

In the past fifteen months—i.e., beginning with and including the Israeli-Arab ‘war’—Russia has transformed the strategic situation in the Mediterranean and the Middle East and pre-empted the West’s position East of Suez and in the Indian Ocean. But while our suitably horrified gaze is focused on Czechoslovakia, nobody notices this; and the terrified commentators tell us that this Russian blunder not only endangers those beautiful bridges to the East but, horror of horrors, may encourage a return to republicanism in America, undoing the work of thirty-five years of Democratic dictatorship.

(Sept. 8, 1968.)

* * *

Miss Barbara Ward had lots of fun at Uppsala telling the Assembly of the World Council of Churches that the world’s troubles were due to the ‘fact’ that twenty percent of people had eighty percent of the money. This means that for every £100, twenty people have an average of £4 each, and eighty an average of five shillings each—one sixteenth as much as those in the 80% group. If the whole £100 were evenly distributed, everyone would receive £1.

Miss Ward is dealing with ratios, so the £1 can be multiplied by whatever factor brings it to a subsistence level over any unit time period—weekly wage or annual income; and then this can be multiplied by the total of the world’s population, and the result compared with the figures given as Gross National Products. It is to be hoped that Miss Ward will take time off from laying down the law to do this necessary little bit of homework.

But there still remains a question, out of which several other questions arise. The figure to be found relates only to a *subsistence* level for a world population ‘equalised’ by soaking the rich and distributing to the poor—the favourite pastime of the Socialists and the Financiers (strange bedfellows, but bedfellows nevertheless). Assuming an austere, but reasonably comfortable level of equalised subsistence, who is going to pay for the Rolls Royce which no doubt on occasions transports Miss Ward about her duties; or the jet aircraft to take her to Uppsala? Who is going to pay for those triumphs of modern architecture, the abundant Bank and Insurance Company buildings? For decency’s sake, we must assume that such conspicuous consumption as State Banquets and luxury accommodation on international conferences are ‘out’. But who is going to pay for space vehicles, Data Processing Machines (equality requires a lot of data processing), and advances in automation? And, above all, who will pay for the favourable balance of trade, and pay the interest due and accruing on debts to international financiers? Also . . . ?

(Sept. 8, 1968.)

* * *

It now (i.e., since the first of these notes was written) appears that the ‘price’ (a heavy price, the News says) that the Czechoslovaks will have to pay for the withdrawal of Russian troops is that the Russians must maintain troops along Czechoslovakia’s western border with West Germany; and the Press must refrain from any criticism of members of the Warsaw Pact.

The ‘crisis’ bears a strong family resemblance to the Israeli-Arab ‘crisis’—long and careful preparation, great drama and tension, massive display of fireworks, skilful deployment of students and demonstrators, minimum casualties, and maximum confusion. *And*—the transformation of the logistic situation.

As Sir John Glubb has pointed out, the great problem of modern warfare is the pre-positioning of heavy military equipment for the use of troops which can be concentrated at a given point in a matter of hours, by air.

Russia is said to be ‘afraid’ of an attack by West Germany. West Germany is bounded to the north by East Germany, bent on the Communist ‘reunification’ of the two Germany’s; on the south by ‘neutral’ Austria and neutral Switzerland. Czechoslovakia’s western border *penetrates* into West Germany, and opposite this border, France (which pursues Communist objectives) *penetrates* into West Germany.

Czechoslovakia itself is a relatively narrow land passage direct from Russia *into* West Germany. ‘East’ Europe, West Russia, and the Middle East from the Heartland—the territorial basis of world conquest, as envisaged by the geopoliticians. *

*See *The State of the World*: Tidal Publications.

So, in short, Russia (or Communism, which envisages the victory of a *world* Communist system) has achieved an almost bloodless *logistic* victory. If West Germany reacts to what can obviously be seen as a threat by a *logistic response*, this can be denounced by Russia from a secure logistic position as an ‘act of aggression’. And, because of the existence of the Communist international espionage system*, even West Germany’s mere intentions would be instantly known to the Kremlin. Thus, the Czechoslovak ‘crisis’ has achieved the paralysis of West German (and NATO) initiative.

*See *Theory of Subversive Action*: R. Cosyns-Verhaegen: Tidal Publications.

In this way, World Dominion advances, peacefully, war ‘deterred’ by the nuclear umbrella (or parity of destructive capability by the two Great Powers).

(Sept. 8, 1968.)

* * *

INSTANT DANGER: A generation has passed since the Munich crisis, so that it is worth recalling that period.

For several years prior to Munich, Germany had been re-arming. Adolph Hitler had published *Mein Kampf*, a blue-print of his designs if ever there was one. On the other hand, the Bank “of England” financed German re-armament, and the Socialists were pacifists. Foreign Correspondents, notably Douglas Reed, sent home warning dispatches; but they were played down by the Press, especially by the *Times*, from which Mr. Reed resigned in disgust.

Hitler pursued his plans to a point where it became obvious that he was close to a position where he could conquer the whole of Europe, although he denounced Communism, as entrenched in Russia, as the real enemy. So his claim to Sudeten Germany, in the possession of Czechoslovakia, was made an issue of general war. But Britain, thanks to the Socialists, who could have used the re-armament of Great Britain to overcome the great depression (in the best Keynesian manner), but didn’t, was totally unprepared for war; and Mr. Chamberlain made a deal with Hitler—the Munich Agreement—which postponed war for a year. It was evident enough then, but is quite certain in retrospect, that had Great Britain with or without allies, declared war on Germany in 1938, Europe would have been overrun and Great Britain defeated—forever.

However, despite the profound relief of the nation it was clear that our Wall St. masters were displeased—or pretended to be. At all events, the pacifist Socialists began screaming for war, and a campaign of vilification of Chamberlain unprecedented in British history took rapid shape. The political commentary industry worked overtime to build up a war psychology, and Hitler and the Germans were described in terms that have never been applied to Stalin and the Communists. War became certain.

It is a cardinal article of faith among honest-to-God-is-dead Socialists that ‘Hitler’ was bent on world conquest. Very likely he was, although hedisclaimed the intention. The Communists, however, continuously and emphatically have proclaimed exactly the same intention, only to be met by polite disbelief by the Socialists and Liberals (those who believe it, of course, think it a good thing). The Russian version of *Mein Kampf* is *Foundations of Leninism*, by J. Stalin; and there are hundreds, if not thousands, of other texts. The Liberals disbelieved Hitler—that Communism is the enemy—and disbelieve the Communists—that *they* are the enemy. Who *is* the enemy? The British?

If the situation was menacing in 1938, it is a hundred times more dangerous now.

Communist strategy has been, and is, to achieve peacefully’ such a change in the military balance of power as to achieve the conquest of Europe ‘by surprise’.

According to some Defence Correspondents, the Russian move ‘against’ Czechoslovakia must have taken six months to plan, and even they seem surprised by the precision of the operation. Does it take 600,000 troops and 20,000 tanks to ‘subdue’ Czechoslovakia? Suppose that in March, 1968, the Kremlin had proclaimed its intention of moving these forces closer to West Germany in August, with the intention of ‘reuniting’ Germany. The NATO forces *might* have responded. Has NATO now six months to prepare logistically for a conventional war? Can NATO use tactical nuclear weapons without slaughtering Czechoslovaks and our ‘friends’ the Yugoslavs? Can we save the West Germans without killing the West Germans? Will U.S. public opinion risk nuclear missiles on their cities to ‘save’ West Germany, or even Europe? If not, can Britain, which defied Hitler, deter Russia?

Those who understand the true operation of the financial system will realise that an economic ‘crisis’ can be precipitated overnight when the time is ripe—the ground is being prepared by the ‘danger’ to sterling and the ‘doubts’ about the dollar. When Mr. Wilson has demonstrated (as he was put in power to demonstrate) that socialist technological miracles cannot save Britain, the mysterious consortium of European financiers will ‘decide’ not to go on making loans to ‘support sterling’. Unsupported, sterling, “one of the world’s reserve currencies”, collapses, disrupting international trade and creating financial havoc—all very ‘accidental’. And then the strikes begin. And the oil is cut off.

For more than fifty years Communism has maintained in Russia and elsewhere training establishments, the equivalent of universities, to turn out men as highly qualified in theoretical and practical Communism as a system of seizing and maintaining World Government as are engineers or medical practitioners in their disciplines. These experts, distributed throughout the world, but as articulated by the Kremlin as is the structure of an army, comprise at the same time a Fifth Column such as Hitler never dreamed of, and an intelligence network so secure (because composed of nationals dedicated to internationalism) that it is certain that there are no government secrets anywhere in the world which are not known almost instantly to the Kremlin. One agent in any department of government, or industry, is sufficient*.

*See *Theory of Subversive Action*, R. Cosyns-Verhaegen, Tidal Publications.

In the light of all this, it ought to be plain that Europe hasn’t a dog’s chance. Lenin himself described the “war for the overthrow of the international bourgeoisie” as “a hundred times more difficult, prolonged and complicated than the most stubborn of ordinary wars between states”. But Lenin, like his successors, believed it could be done; and, with International Finance behind the effort, he seems to have been right. You, dear reader, if a property-owning citizen, are one of the international bourgeoisie. If you are merely an international financier, have no worries. You are Socialism’s bread *and* butter.

Whether, as Dimitri Manuilski claimed it would, the U.S.A. will fall into their hands “like an over-ripe fruit”, remains to be seen.

(Sept. 21, 1968.)

* * *

Mr. H. Wilson’s equivalent rank in the hierarchy of World Government, in which he is pleased to play his revolting role, is about that of Sergeant, his immediate superior being a Master Sergeant in Washington. As it is not for him to reason why, it hardly matters what he thinks of the fraudulent financial system, under which the international financiers grant one loan after another to ‘bolster sterling’. He probably knows that Britain’s indebtedness can *never* be repaid in kind—to attempt it would be to hypothecate the export of Britain’s *total* production for years ahead. The indebtedness is simply an instrument of coercion to enforce a tyranny over the British people until such time as the military sanctions of the World Government are overtly established, and Britain can be regarded as merely a territorial Province of One World. With the Financier in ultimate control, debts will no longer signify, and money can become a pure rationing system, with the consumer having no say (he has little now) over the programme of production. Apart from the proletariat’s rations, it will all be for export—to underdeveloped countries—*of course*. Ask Miss Barbara Ward of Uppsala.

In the meantime, Sergeant Wilson can drill the O.Rs. in ‘Britain’, and lead his Section in the War

against Rhodesia.

Douglas once whimsically remarked to the effect that if, in the prevailing high winds, a chimney-pot were blown off and fell on Mr. Emanuel Shinwell, he could regard the occurrence with some equanimity. At least the previous Socialist Government had the pretext of post-war ‘difficulties’ to justify its programmes of austerity and regimentation; but Mr. Wilson has behind him a period of over twenty years of ‘recovery’, in which our unconditionally defeated ‘enemies’, Germany and Japan, have achieved the economic miracles which Sergeant Wilson periodically and unavailingly promises us.

So, “fight the good fight” (against the British and the Rhodesians); insult the South Africans, and arm the Nigerians—sparrows all.

No doubt, one of the high attractions of ballot-box democracy for Sergeant Wilson and his ilk is that the worst that can happen to them is defeat at an election. Unless the Russians come, that is. And the Russians *are* closer than they were a month or two ago.

(Sept. 21, 1968.)

* * *

It is too much to suppose that, with very few exceptions, all political commentators are Communists, secret or otherwise. But they behave as if they were. The ‘line’ on the Russian ‘invasion of Czechoslovakia’ was established and stabilised within a few days. Russia has made an enormous ‘blunder’, has risked losing the goodwill of the West, has threatened trade, hardened America’s attitude, and jeopardised the prospects of peace in Vietnam; and increased the prospects of a disastrous Republican victory in the U.S. How stupid can they be?

Indeed, Russia is more to be pitied than blamed; so it is vital to maintain the dialogue with them, and continue cultural exchanges. Perhaps this time Russia has learned her lesson—from the wonderfully restrained Czechs (and Slovaks). If not, Sergeant Wilson may not speak to her any more. So there!

(Sept. 21, 1968.)

* * *

Mr. Enoch Powell, as reported in the *Times* of Sept. 19, 1968, “scorns” an East-of-Suez role for Britain, on the grounds that it arose only out of the British connection with India. Today, says Mr. Powell, there is no India, and no route to India. But he also says: “Twice in our lifetime we have been all but overwhelmed by a military power located 200 miles away.” The defence of Britain required “that the minimum external communications, essential in war, should be secure and that the Continent be denied to any enemy so far as he might use it to attack the British Isles, or in the worst case that such an attack should be repelled”. And he dismisses the presence of Russian warships in the Mediterranean as “no more remarkable and no more alarming than the appearance of Russian warships in the Skaggerat”.

Sir John Glubb (Glubb Pasha), thoroughly familiar through practical military experience with Middle East realities, writes in his little (but profound) book *The Middle East Crisis* (1967): “The two World Wars ended in victory for the Western Allies because Britain held Egypt and naval command of the Mediterranean. In these circumstances, Germany, like Napoleon, could not win the war, no matter how great her land victories.”

Who could be Mr. Powell’s “any enemy” which might use the Continent to threaten Britain? And when?

It is Communist Russia’s claim, not ours, that they expect to take over the whole world for Communism. This would inevitably involve the conquest of Europe, “from the Atlantic to the Urals” in de Gaulle’s words. The opinion that this cannot be done rests on two assumptions: that the possibility of the use of atomic weapons will deter the attempt, and that in the last resort, short of nuclear deterrence, the U.S.A. will not allow it.

U.S. News & World Report, Sept. 16, 1968, summarises the official findings of a special subcommittee of the U.S. House Armed Services Committee. It found: "While Soviet strength is mounting, American forces in troubled Europe are to be found in a 'marginal state of readiness', with no improvement in sight.

"The U.S. Army in Europe is short of combat troops, new weapons, major items of equipment, trained officers.

"The Air Force is short of aircraft, air crews, dispersed airfields, and storage facilities."

The report of the subcommittee, which was compiled over the course of almost a year, was based on more than 5,000 pages of testimony. Bearing in mind the facilities available to U.S. House Committees (and subcommittees), it must surely be regarded as being as authoritative as anything we are likely to find in these days of slanted reporting.

In the light of this, *can* the Continent be denied to any enemy insofar as he might use it to attack the British Isles? Is the presence of Russian warships in the Mediterranean unremarkable? *U.S. News* notes, from the subcommittee's report, that the U.S.'s "capacity to keep two carriers in the Mediterranean 'is being stretched to the limit' ". How soon can that capacity be extended to the point of safety?

From the subcommittee's report, "heavily censored as to many specific shortages", but noting a shortage of "major items of equipment" and a depletion of stockpiles, it appears to be an inescapable conclusion that "any enemy" of the British Isles has an unprecedented opportunity of using the Continent for an attack. If there is no enemy, it does not matter. But if there is an enemy, is he going to sit by passively and see his opportunity eroded?

It is, perhaps, worth recalling that the Soviets regard British and U.S. troops in Europe as *hostages*. Since the Soviets do not appear to be short of major items of equipment, and have moved stockpiles to the very borders of West Germany, it is not difficult to see what they mean, and what the situation means to the British.

(Oct. 5, 1968.)

* * *

Decidedly the time has come to call a spade a spade, which means considering the personal responsibilities involved in the situation which the British face. Britain—just—survived two world wars, and for centuries has not suffered a foreign invasion, except that due to unrestricted immigration and, what amounts almost to the same thing, the presence of traitors, of both the Fabian and the Communist variety, in their midst, some of them occupying positions of high office.

In matters of defence, an officer of the rank of Wing Commander in the Air Force may be presumed to write as an expert, and the words of Wing Commander Sir John Hodsoll, which appeared in a letter published in the *Daily Telegraph*, Sept. 19, 1968, should be carefully considered, especially those which we emphasise, with a view to appropriate action, if any is still possible. The least would be to call those responsible to account.

"Sir—The speed with which the Warsaw Pact forces moved into Czechoslovakia has shown clearly the utter unreality of the Government's assumptions as to the amount of warning we might receive—hours, not days or weeks. Also of leaving this country devoid of any Home Defence organisation.

"I imagine that NATO will be taking a hard look at the state of such defences in their member countries, along with their review of the armed forces at their disposal. I do not suppose they will look with any satisfaction at the state of unpreparedness in Britain, which at one time had the finest Civil Defence Service in the world.

"The impression, which the Government *has tried to put over*, that Civil Defence can be reconstituted in time to meet an emergency, is complete rubbish. *The greatest pains have been taken to destroy the*

organisation, and even discourage the volunteers forming themselves into disaster squads. There is no framework left on which anything can be rebuilt.

“As regards training, all local and central facilities *have been scrapped* except the Home Office* School at Easingwold, which is being turned into a rat-bag of staff college, technical school and goodness knows what else. A grossly unfair burden has been put on the staff to deal with what is obviously complete nonsense.

*The Home Office is the potential equivalent, and in some ways the actual equivalent, of the Headquarters of the NKVD.—*Ed.*
T.S.C.

“Since the regional organisation will shortly cease to exist, the Home Office will now have to communicate directly with all the principal local authorities; as will other Government Departments with those under their wing. *How it is proposed to keep in touch with them or to communicate quickly with them in an emergency* is anyone’s guess. The 5d. stamp won’t help when the Russians are moving.

”JOHN HODSOLL
“Tarrant Rushton,
“Dorset.”

So much for the reverse of this particular coin. What of the obverse?

The reader at this point should refer to the short but highly important book, *Theory of Subversive Action**, only recently available in an English translation. Parallel to the Home Office lines of communication with “local authorities”, the Communist subversive apparatus has its own headquarters (under the direction of the Kremlin, the most fully informed intelligence organisation in the world) with lines of communication to its own “local authorities”. Cosyns-Verhaegen names no names, and makes no accusations; his book is like a lens placed before an eye with defective vision: what had been a blur stands forth with startling clarity. There is abundant evidence, well known to everyone but not *clearly* seen, of subversive activity in Britain. Has the Government taken “the greatest pains to destroy the organisation” which makes the massive subversion possible?

*R. Cosyns-Verhaegen: Tidal Publications.

Members of Parliament, *representing their constituents*, have the right, duty, and immunity to confront the Government, and Mr. Wilson in particular as the man nominally answerable to Her Majesty the Queen, and thus to British citizens, with the question of responsibility for the most appalling danger which has ever faced the British people. If the danger materialises, impeachment is called for.

Constituents may have hours ... or days ... or weeks to press on their Representatives in Parliament the question of impeachment—their final recourse but, miserably, not remedy. But God helps those who help themselves, and it is God’s help which is needed now.

(Oct. 19, 1968.)

* * *

The ABC weekly broadcast feature, “International”, carried in its edition of Sept. 27, 1968, the following report by Ritchie McEwen, of the London School of Economics:

“Yugoslavia is bringing its defence to combat readiness. World War II partisans who fought with Marshall Tito against the Germans are ready to take to the mountain fastnesses again, just as they did more than 25 years ago, if the Russians should decide to invade their country.

“For the past few weeks the veterans of World War II have been holding meetings throughout the country to discuss the measures they would take if their country is again invaded. Although most of the former partisans are now well over 40, some past 60, they claim that they have not lost their skill at mountain fighting.

“High up in the mountains the almost impregnable fastnesses which served Tito so well during the occupation have been modernised. Twenty mountain roads high above the valley have been broadened at selected points where they run straight and level for several hundred yards, to act as emergency landing strips, and the primitive bunkers used in World War II have been strengthened with ferroconcrete and additional camouflage ready for all eventualities. The Yugoslav Army have been quietly placed on an emergency footing and garrisons have been brought up to full strength, to that troops have been deliberately concentrated 30 to 40 miles inside the border so as to avoid the danger of frontier incidents.

“Garrisons along Yugoslavia’s western frontier facing Austria and Italy have been strengthened too, so that Russia will not be able to put forward the same excuses as in the case of Czechoslovakia that Yugoslavia is insufficiently prepared to defend herself against Capitalist aggression from the West. Almost daily reports of increasing military activity along the Hungarian and Bulgarian frontiers are coming in, and shortly a fresh series of Warsaw Pact staff manoeuvres are to begin, alarmingly similar to those that preceded the occupation of Czechoslovakia.

“But despite the gathering of the clouds there is no sign of panic in any part of Yugoslavia. Marshall Tito himself is remaining in his summer residence on the Isle of Brioli. There is no sign of panic buying of foodstuffs in the towns and no one really believes that the Kremlin leaders will decide to invade the country; but if they do so the Yugoslavs are determined to fight, if need be to continue the struggle under seasoned partisans of World War II high up in the mountain fastnesses which proved their value so well nearly 30 years ago.”



Yugoslavia has no common frontier with Russia, and therefore is not subject to direct invasion by Russia. On the other hand, Italy is just across the Adriatic Sea, within very comfortable flying distance from those ‘emergency’ landing strips high in the mountain fastnesses. The American Mediterranean fleet is based on Salerno, well in the south of Italy. Communist Russian troops are now concentrated to the north of Austria, and Communist Yugoslav troops to the south. This ‘defensive’ posture by Yugoslavia against Capitalist aggression by the West should certainly deter Russia from invading Yugoslavia. Perhaps, indeed, Russia lent Yugoslavia the bulldozers etc. to broaden those roads, and in the true spirit of Communist rivalry, supplied the cement to modernise those veteran bunkers. But not, of course, the bombs to be used against the Russian comrades struggling upwards from the valleys. (Oct. 19, 1968.)

“At the same time, however, we saw the danger that Mr. Wilson, while ostensibly seeking agreement, might in fact be aiming at just the opposite in a manoeuvre the point of which would be to secure what he could parade as proof that no settlement with the ‘rebel regime’ was possible. The breakdown of the talks leaves the suspicion that the latter course was adopted.” London *Daily Telegraph*, Oct. 14, 1968.

History has demonstrated often enough that Prime Ministers have made mistakes; but to be virtually accused of outright dishonesty within a term of office by a responsible newspaper is something else again. If Mr. Wilson’s hoped for breakdown of law and order in Rhodesia provides the pretext for armed

intervention, it is to be hoped that he will be in the front line of the invasion forces, if he has not been dealt with at home before then.

(Nov. 2, 1968.)

* * *

Paul Scott, in an article in *Human Events*, Sept. 7, 1968, reports that, according to intelligence briefings for U.S. presidential candidates, the dress rehearsal for the military ‘intervention’ in Czechoslovakia “included the building of roads and airfields and laying of camouflaged pipeline in rough country. Tanks and trucks were landed from supply planes. Other planes brought fuel and soldiers”.

Why the camouflage? And is the pipeline to be pulled up when the ‘intervention’ terminates? Is NATO laying pipeline to points where surprise attacks might occur?

Writing in *News of the World*, Oct. 13, 1968, Desmond Donnelly says: “The Russian defence planners have been baulked by NATO’s land defences ever since 1949. This [the Russian naval build-up in the Mediterranean] is the crucial attempt to outflank NATO.”

Defence is against *attack*; how do you defend yourself against defence? And an attempt to outflank is a preliminary to attack—or, if successful, to ultimatum.

This strange misuse of words seems to be evidence of a trance-like state of mind, very reminiscent of the pre-1939 years so faithfully described by Leopold Schwarzschild in his *World in Trance* (London: Hamish Hamilton, 1943). He recalls the publication in 1935 by the British Government of a White Book on Germany’s rearmament, and writes “what a signal for the zealots and the demagogues! A storm broke out over the White Book. The *News Chronicle* stated with bitterness: ‘The consequence is a catastrophic increase of Germany’s suspicions and fear of encirclement. In twenty-four hours, the British Government has immeasurably deteriorated the entire international situation.’ ‘To publish such assertions . . .’ wrote the *Economist*, ‘makes Germany a scapegoat. . . . The document does not take the German point of view into consideration and creates the impression that England has joined in the encirclement of Germany’ [March 9, 1935]”.

Similar sentiments abound today. Russia can repeatedly assert that Communism represents the “wave of the future”, that Communism will “bury” us; but the zealots and demagogues and the Weeklies accept Communism’s ‘defensive’ posture while the biggest logistic manoeuvre since World War II takes place in the strategic heart of Europe, and Europe is outflanked by Russia under the guise of military aid to the Arabs.

What Schwarzschild wrote of spring 1935, when Germany announced conscription, is true of the situation following the 1967 Israeli-Arab ‘war’: “A world had collapsed. What was buried under the debris was not a volume of printed paper, not a piece of parchment, a treaty, a statute, but the whole structure of international co-operation. The very foundations of that structure had cracked; the meaning of the victory of 1918 had ceased to exist. What had been won by dint of the fiercest struggles and at the cost of millions of lives, not to mention the sufferings and sacrifices of hundreds of millions, had been squandered and lost.”

There once was, in a very real sense, a *Pax Britannica*, essentially benevolent, and founded on an industrial power only a fraction of Britain’s present potential power. Through treachery, treason, and financial chicanery that position has been squandered, and the lives of more millions placed in dire jeopardy. For the third time we are threatened with rivers of blood, this time finally to transform the monopoly of credit into a monopoly, absolute and ruthless, of power eternal. Unless the criminals responsible are brought to judgment, even as C. H. Douglas foresaw, there is no hope for Christian civilisation visible.

(Nov. 2, 1968.)

* * *

It is highly important, in considering overall Communist strategy, to remember that an essential

ingredient is the Marxian prediction of the ‘inevitable’ collapse of the Capitalist industrial system; the Communist Party is organised to be ready to form an alternative government when that catastrophe occurs. Little things like strikes, demonstrations, and sabotage, are partly rehearsals for “the day”, and partly an effort to speed up the collapse which they await. When it comes (and the Wilson regime’s economic and other policies are hastening the day), the Communists are *ready* to seize power; and, of course, when that day comes, they will be able to call on the Comrades who by then will be just across the Channel, to assist them in maintaining it. Of course, employment will quickly be found for the 700,000 unemployed bequeathed to the revolutionaries by the bourgeois Social Democratic Government, guilty of having compromised with the reactionary forces of Capitalism (like the Gnomes of Zurich, say). It is doubtful that they will be under the supervision of Sergeant Wilson, whose eventual fate is, perhaps, indeterminate.

On the other hand, just think of the joyous reconciliation in Peking and Moscow as the Chinese gratefully acknowledge the success of Moscow’s leadership of the World Revolution. And to demonstrate Finance’s impartiality, perhaps the Star of Wall St. will be bestowed on *both* leaderships.

(Nov. 2, 1968.)

* * *

The victory of the British police in the Battle for London is a victory for the Anglo-Saxon character which Major Douglas so long ago recognised as the greatest barrier to the attempt at World Dominion—a barrier recognised, too, by Marshall Tito as Communism’s major target. But the revolutionary form of Communism, now progressing violently in the miscegenated United States of America, has never taken root in Britain. The destruction of Britain is being accomplished by the foreign infestation of Fabianism.

The rate of this destruction, and its scale, are probably unprecedented in history. Great Britain initiated and contributed to the industrialisation of the world, and for a century poured out its wealth into the development of overseas territories. Despite the destruction of the 1914-18 war, Great Britain emerged with an enhanced industrial capacity—but with a war debt and secret agreements which, as President Wilson wrote to Colonel House, delivered her into U.S. hands. It was not until just prior to the renewed outbreak of war in 1939 that the anonymous Fabian offshoot Political and Economic Planning group (P.E.P.) disclosed that the Big Idea underlying Britain’s downfall was the strategy that “only in war, or under threat of war, would any British government embark on large-scale planning”; but we can be sure that this idea underlay the 1914 war.

In 1944, Professor F. A. Hayek published his book *The Road to Serfdom*. He had spent about half his adult life in Austria, “in close touch with German intellectual life”, and the second half in the U.S. and England. This circumstance produced “an experience as near as possible to twice living through the same period”. That is to say, he lived through the period of the evolution of ideas of centralised planning into the ruthless barbarity of the totalitarian State; and seeing the germination and rapid flourishing of those same ideas in Britain during the 1939 war, he wrote his book because “it is necessary now to state the unpalatable truth that it is Germany whose fate we are in some danger of repeating”.

Professor Hayek understood the part played by the Great German General Staff in the Socialist developments in Germany, but did not, as Douglas did, realise that that General Staff was in its turn the tool of International Financial interests, and was used to bulldoze the path to World Government.

But Professor Hayek’s analyses and forecasts have progressively come true in Britain, and his book is perhaps more interesting and important now as a history than it was, when published, as a prophecy.

(Nov. 16, 1968.)

* * *

Elsewhere than in the British Press, it has often enough been pointed out that General de Gaulle furthers Communist objectives. So his endeavour to persuade Turkey to get rid of the 10,000 Americans stationed on her soil is quite consistent with his idea of “Europe from the Atlantic to the Urals”—with Soviet co-operation, or course.

(Nov. 16, 1968.)

* * *

The sceptical philosopher, Professor C. E. M. Joad, was brought to a belief in God, because he could not disbelieve the evidence of the existence of Evil. Douglas put the matter thus: “To take only the period of history covered by the three hundred years since Cromwell, the evidence for the existence of a conscious, organised Evil Purpose in the world appears so overwhelming that it would seem axiomatic that mankind could have no prior interest than to root out its Incarnations wherever found.”

In this sense Germany, organised by Socialism, was *used* as an instrument to destroy, through two stages of world war, the existing world order—a world order characterised by the predominance of Western civilisation, slowly built on the foundations of Christianity and Greek and Roman thought, and holding out the promise of betterment of all mankind through the accelerating transfer of the Curse of Adam from men to machines. Into this order a Prussianised and socialised Germany was driven as a wedge. In Professor Hayek’s words: “It was the decisive step in the destruction of that civilisation which modern man had built up from the age of the Renaissance and which was above all an individualist civilisation.”

This demolition of a civilisation of expanding freedom for the individual was simply the necessary first step for the imposition of a despotic and rigid World Government, of which Communist Russia is the contemporary instrument, an instrument more and more obviously utilised by the Money Power, with its headquarters in Wall St. and Washington. Communism is simply international socialism maintained by force of arms—Nazism writ on a worldwide scale, the world as it would have become had Hitler conquered it. British National Socialism is nothing but international socialism’s Fifth Column. The British Labour Party, just as in the 1930s it paved the way for German re-armament, is paving the way for Communist conquest, retreating from world positions which promptly fall to Russian domination. Hitler lied and screamed Peace, to conceal his aims until he could only be stopped by war. But Russia lies and works Peaceful Coexistence for all its worth—until Russia *cannot* be stopped by war. Communism, and the shadowy Power behind it, no longer wants a world in ruins; it wants a world consolidated in slavery, a world made safe for the perpetual rule of the descendants of an imagined elite.

(Nov. 16, 1968.)

QUESTIONS FOR YOUR REPRESENTATIVE IN PARLIAMENT:

1. The Communists have always said they will take the whole world, and bury us. Do you think they mean it?

2. The Communists have made unimpeded progress since 1917, and are now in a position through subversion backed by force of arms to dominate Europe *unless the U.S. is prepared to risk nuclear attack on its own cities*. If the situation should look too much like a *fait accompli* for the U.S. to undertake such a risk, do you think we should surrender without fighting?

3. Do you think the Prime Minister, from whatever reason, has reduced our armed forces to a point where resistance is impossible, as in Czechoslovakia?

(Nov. 16, 1968.)

* * *

The U.S.S.R. has suddenly emerged as a great maritime power (for which, of course, there must have been long preparation). The significant feature is that the U.S.S.R. is cutting freight-rates, thus threatening the ‘free’-world economies and contributing to that anticipated economic breakdown of the ‘Capitalist’ system which plays so large a part in Finance-Communism’s global strategy.

This undercutting is, of course, an inverted application of Social Credit monetary technique: the lowering of the price of freight services by the provision of credit to compensate the bookkeeping ‘loss’—i.e., if a service can be provided, it can be paid for, just as world war, immeasurably more costly than peace, can be paid for.

(Nov. 30, 1968.)

After a brief wobble, induced by the movement (cleared in advance with Washington) of Warsaw Pact troops through Czechoslovakia to the German border, Sovietologists and other slightly assorted political commentators are firmly back in the 'Russia is mellowing' *detente* groove. Some even suggest that NATO has been relatively strengthened, because Czechoslovakia has become 'less reliable' as a member of the Warsaw Pact.

Hitler wrote (*Mein Kampf*): "The pacifist-humane ideal is perhaps quite satisfactory once the highest type of man has conquered and subjected the world, so that he is the only master of the globe." ". . . peace, established by the victorious sword of a people of overlords which can bend the world to the service of a higher culture." And Herr Ewald Banse, Nazi professor of military science: "Is it possible for the community of ninety million Germans in central Europe to achieve both hegemony in Europe and supremacy in the world outside? The fact that this riddle has not yet been solved does not prove that it is insoluble."*

**Germany Prepares for War: quoted by Leopold Schwarzschild, World in Trance.*

But before Hitler, Lenin: "To carry on a war for the overthrow of the international bourgeois, a war which is a hundred times more difficult, prolonged and complicated than the most stubborn of ordinary wars between states. . . ." For temporary and practical purposes, the shadowy backers of Pan-Germanism and Communism now put forward Party Communists as "the highest type of man". The Germans were only temporary contenders, serving an intermediate purpose.

From the time of Versailles onwards, the shadowy powers behind Germany prepared, through the Great German General Staff (G.D.G.S.), for the resumption of war; and by the time Hitler came to power, the foundations had been laid, in the form of the expansion of an officer corps, and secret rearmament. But 1933 to 1935 were the critical years, during which Germany had to become strong enough to be able openly to announce conscription. The point of no return from advance towards world war lay in those years.

In 1934, Schwarzschild wrote: "A few last months still remain in which to make good the mistakes of fourteen years. During those few months it is the world's foremost task to throttle the continuation of German rearmament at all costs. . . . But after the lapse of those few months there will be nothing more to be prevented."

Schwarzschild's prescription for this situation was "a brutal presentation of force [as] the only means to peace, the guaranteed means to peace. . . . The method is simple. It is based upon the fact that Germany will not for some months to come be in a position to cope with the concentrated military strength of France, let alone with that of a collection of states. During the short intervening period of incomplete armament—and only during this intervening period—she would with absolute certainty suffer annihilation if the cannons began to roar". This was the period when the British Socialists, the Press, and the BBC were fervidly pro-German, just as their present fervour for the U.S.S.R. is only mildly tempered by the events in Czechoslovakia.

After twenty-two years of 'mistakes' following the second German phase of the war for World Hegemony, we passed the point of no return towards war or surrender with the entrance of the Russian navy in force into the Mediterranean, and the pre-positioning of heavy military equipment in the Middle East, as well as the staffing of airfields along the Mediterranean (see report by Ronald Payne, *Sunday Telegraph*, Nov. 10, 1968).

This situation is 1934 in reverse. *The U.S.S.R. now holds the "concentrated military power" formerly held by France, but, unlike France then, is prepared and ready to use it—"brutally"—; and NATO vis-a-vis that strength is in the former position of Germany.* The communiqué of the belated (in relation to the European situation) meeting of the NATO Council tacitly admits this, in calling for the strengthening—i.e., rearming—of NATO's run-down defences. But rearming requires time; *it is Russia* which controls the critical few months. Schwarzschild's question arises in a new Communist form: "Will NATO be permitted to go through the period of military weakness unmolested? Or will she be forced to abandon her 'aggressive path?'" As was easily predictable (see *T.S.C.*, Sept. 18, 1968) the answer came swiftly: within twenty-four hours of the communiqué Moscow denounced it as clear evidence of NATO's aggressive designs—and, by implication, justification for "the brutal presentation of force [as] the only means to [Communist] peace".

Mr. George Stewart, however, has gaily assured his country that the NATO communiqué will deter Russia.

In an ABC news review (Nov. 1, 1968) Ritchie McEwen disclosed that to forestall 'invasion', Yugoslavia has agreed with Moscow on certain troop dispositions, and the availability to Russia of certain airfields. This, of course, makes the Adriatic a potential Russian preserve, with an implied threat to Greece, Italy and Turkey.

Let Schwarzschild speak again: "A Europe [but this time it is a Warsaw Pact] which understands the hour, which knows how to speak in plain terms to the new rulers of Germany, will bring home everything it wants on the points of its bayonets—without having to make use of one single bayonet, without spilling a single drop of blood. By force and yet without war Europe's rush towards a war of annihilation can be arrested. But only by force. And only for a few months more." It might be Khrushchev speaking.

Despite his admitted admiration for Harold Wilson's audacious virtuosity as a politician caught in prevarication, Sir Arthur Bryant some weeks ago wrote in the *Illustrated London News* to the effect that the guilt of the present British Government in relation to the present situation far exceeds that of the 'guilty' men of Munich. Of course it does. We are confronted with exactly the same threat of annihilation as was constituted by Nazi Germany, but this time a threat better prepared, and enormously better mounted; and even proceeding from the same ultimate source—the shadowy forces behind the Moscow-Washington Axis.

"There is a direct line through Marxian Socialism and the endowment of the London School of Economics [which seems now to have served its purpose] by Sir Ernest Cassel, the large sums donated to the Labour Party by German-speaking Jews, and its close connection with German Socialists, which connects the German General Staff with the attempt [long since achieved] to bureaucratise this country. The object is simple. The G.D.G.S. knows exactly how to use a bureaucracy for its own ends, without the bureaucracy having any conscious participation. And the end is the downfall of Great Britain [also accomplished], as a step to World Dominion.

[To this end] "The coalition of Germany [i.e. the G.D.G.S.*] and Russia is logical, but the Russian mentality is very dissimilar to that of the German, and may easily contribute unrehearsed developments." (C. H. Douglas: *The Brief For the Prosecution*; 1944.)

*See *The State of the World*. Tidal Publications.

There can be no doubt that the downfall of Great Britain has been accomplished through the bureaucracy (plus the financial policies dictated by Washington). But Great Britain did not bureaucratise itself; bureaucracy was imposed by the Socialist politicians—in the main, by the Labour Party Socialists, but only to a lesser extent by the Conservative Party Socialists. In any case, there is no way of bringing a bureaucracy to account. But that is not to say that *nobody* should be brought to account.

Short of the remote possibility that the U.S.A. Administration (the Washington component of the Washington-Moscow Axis—it will be the same under President Nixon—) can be forced by Conservative U.S. public opinion to intervene *immediately* in the European-Mediterranean situation in such a way that the use of strategic nuclear weapons if necessary *would not be open to doubt*, BRITAIN IS NOW FACED WITH THE PROSPECT OF SURRENDER TO COMMUNISM EXTERNAL OR INTERNAL, BRINGING 'COMMUNIST JUSTICE'; OR ANNIHILATION THROUGH WAR.

The present British Government, by the *announcement* of and preparation for withdrawal 'East of Suez', has contributed vastly to the timetable of disaster, bringing forward Communist objectives perhaps by years, and disrupting defence patterns throughout the world; it has gravely weakened British external defences, maintenance of which is a *prime* governmental responsibility; and has destroyed British home defences.

For all this, the man nominally responsible, the Prime Minister, Mr. Harold Wilson, should be impeached.

The idea of impeachment is neither vindictive nor punitive. It is exemplary. It would produce such a

shock throughout the world that American conservative opinion *might* be able to break the Washington-Moscow Axis.

To allow Party loyalty to take precedence in the present situation is to give priority to death or slavery. The present Government demonstrably no longer represents the true majority of the British people, and loyalty to it represents treachery to the people.

(Nov. 30, 1968.)