

THE SOCIAL CREDITER

FOR POLITICAL AND ECONOMIC REALISM

Vol. 35. Nos. 1 and 2.

SATURDAY, FEBRUARY 2, 1957.

Registered at G.P.O. as a Newspaper.
Postage: Home and abroad 2d.

6d. Weekly.

The Development of World Dominion

During the period of the Socialist Administration in Great Britain, following the end of World War II, *The Social Crediter* analysed the activities of that administration in our progress to disaster; and emphasised over and over that a change of administration would not mean a change of policy. The Constitutional issue, philosophy, politics, economics and strategy were examined in the notes under the heading "From Week to Week." Written or inspired by the late C. H. Douglas, these notes are a permanent and invaluable addition to our understanding of the policies of opposed philosophies, and we propose to re-publish a considerable selection of them, both for their relevance to a situation which has developed but not otherwise altered under a 'new' Administration, and for the benefit of new readers of this journal to whom otherwise they are not readily available.

The date of original publication is given in brackets after each item.

• • •

"Russia . . . is the victim of a syndicate organised to destroy the nations. . . . Why are the New York bankers, along with the German General Staff the responsible authors of the Russian Revolution? . . . The solidarity of faith which obtains between the New York bankers and the bolshevist leaders, and the feelings inspired by the sufferings of the Jews in Czarist Russia, are not a sufficient explanation of this paradox. . . . However, are we not paying too great an honour to freemasonry when we attribute to it the greatest share in the genesis of the League and in responsibility for its acts? Is not this secret society a society with limited responsibility, not only by reason of its mental weakness, but also because it is, above all else, the instrument of forces more secret still, and more to be feared? Is it not unjustly accused of all the sins of Jewry? And if freemasonry is but an instrument, then President Wilson was but the instrument of an instrument."

The preceding quotations are taken from *Genève contre la paix* by the Comte de St. Aulaire, Ambassador to Great Britain (1920-1924). The English translation is published by Sheed and Ward. It must be remembered that it is written, not by a propagandist, but by a trained professional diplomat of wide experience. It should be read by every serious student of contemporary events. (February 3, 1945.)

An article, which in its title, "The Political Drift in America," conforms to the sinister convention that no one or nobody is to blame for anything, appears in the December number of the *Nineteenth Century and After*, a Review which, although very attenuated, is maintaining its long and high tradition. The author, Mr. Michael Derrick, sketches

the development of the ideas embodied in the New Deal with the hand of a man who really knows what he is writing about, and its relation to the world in which he lives. The implication of the title is perhaps most concisely contradicted in the paragraph: "The sort of oppressions that are accepted now with the thought that they are part of the price of war would have come in any case, only more gradually, because of the nature of technical progress, and because of the apostles of efficiency, new heirs to the apostles of private wealth, new-style capitalists busy building up their monopolies and corners and combines, not in capital, but in administrative authority."

The article, which concludes "The United States has the urgent message for which the whole world is waiting, but it is not contained in the New Deal. It is 'Hamstring your Governments'" forms a fitting commentary on what Social Crediters suspected twenty-five and knew ten years ago—that we are the victims of the most amazing plot that has even been conceived in the period covered by history, a plot which is completely comprehensive, which balks at nothing, which regards the world panic of 1928-32 and the shambles of 1914-1918 as trivial incidents (from which the plotters have been careful to protect themselves) not of any consequence in relation to The Big Idea.

Mr. Derrick's article should be given the widest publicity. (January 27, 1945.)

• • •

Although the times do not lend themselves to humorous literature, the output of serio-comic booklets seems to grow. We referred to one of them a few weeks ago; another has just reached us from the Carnegie Endowment for International Peace, an organisation having much the same Judaeo-Masonic associations as the League of Nations Union and Chatham House.

Its immediate contribution to sweetness and light is an (American) symposium on what it terms colonies and dependencies. Possibly—we do not know—the proposal to hand over Cyprus to Greece is one of its recommendations, and the rebuke to British policy in Greece and Italy an exhibit. In general it brushes aside any interest of what it calls Suzerain powers without wasting time on enquiry as to their views, and stakes out a claim for a free-for-all in which any gentleman can join without the formality of credentials, knowledge or experience. Having disposed of this situation in a few well chosen words it moves on to an international world association for the protection of individual rights. So if you can't get your petrol coupons, Clarence, you will be able to refer the matter to an enlarged and improved League of Nations in Washington.

(Continued on page 3.)

THE SOCIAL CREDITER

FOR POLITICAL AND ECONOMIC REALISM

This journal expresses and supports the policy of the Social Credit Secretariat, which is a non-party, non-class organisation neither connected with nor supporting any political party, Social Credit or otherwise.

SUBSCRIPTION RATES: *Home and abroad, post free:*
One year 30/-; Six months 15/-; Three months 7s. 6d.
 Offices—*Business and Editorial:* 11, GARFIELD STREET, BELFAST.
Telephone: Belfast 27810.

Social Credit Secretariat

Dr. Basil L. Steele has been appointed Deputy Chairman of the Secretariat for the United Kingdom, effective from January 1, 1957. Dr. Steele's address is Penrhyn Lodge, Gloucester Gate, London, N.W.1.

From Week to Week

Lord Strang, formerly Permanent Under-Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs, contributes to *Time and Tide* (December 8, 1956) an article which displays more of the realities of the Middle East situation than anything else we have seen in print since the 'crisis' became apparent; and, we think, he implies a good deal more. He says that the heart of the problem is Israel, and that we are only at the beginning of the troubles. "It is in essence a crisis in which the future of the Western World is at stake."

It is fantastic to hope that we can survive as "the British" or even, in heaven knows how many individual cases, physically at all, until we understand our situation realistically, and adopt a realistic policy.

The basis of our situation is that the Zionists are at war with the Gentiles, and more particularly with the Christian Gentiles. As the Gentiles, and particularly the Christian Gentiles, refuse to recognise that fact, they are fighting each other for the benefit of the Zionists. Considered merely in financial terms that ought to be plain enough. We defeated Germany in both phases of the World War—yes; but we did not win the war in any realistic sense. We lost our overseas "investments," a great part of our Empire, and accumulated an unrepayable debt. And it is not to 'America' that we are in debt; it is to International Finance, the main weapon of the Zionists, that we are in debt. 'America' comes into the picture because the headquarters of International Finance has been transferred to New York. At the moment, 'America' makes the most useful 'front' for Zionist ambitions. If precedent is followed, however, in due course 'America' will have served its turn.

Money power is a weapon serving Zionist ambitions, or, as we prefer to put it, Zionism's long-term policy, which is simply World Dominion for the Chosen People. World dominion for anyone means a world Police State, since otherwise there would quite certainly be revolt. The first step (involving the consistent application of a steadfast policy over many generations) is to disarm the possible centres of

revolt, in advance. When we have been disarmed, we can be policed.

Great Britain, which has never tried to 'conquer' the world, but did spread civilisation and amenities through a good deal of it, at the cost of an enormous real loss, now called "exploitation," has clearly been the chief barrier for a long time to world dominion by anybody; so that it is perfectly logical to concentrate on disarming Great Britain. The attempts to do it by force, *via* Germany, having failed, the debt situation resulting has been used to involve us in a series of economic crises, the last of which, now in preparation, is calculated to destroy our ability to use our arms.

In this context, the reason for the illegal foundation of the State of Israel is not hard to see—and a clear indication, if ever there was one, of the existence of a long-term Zionist policy. The Jews were offered a much better territory—Uganda—for a National Home; but it was not mere sentiment that led to the rejection of this offer, and the making of a promise to set up a National Home in Palestine one of the conditions imposed on Great Britain by the German Jews surrounding President Wilson as the price of America's entry into the First World War.

Whether, under a realistic economic system, the Middle East really represents one of our vital interests is a separate question; it is certainly a vital interest as things are. And the best, quite probably only way, of destroying our position in the Middle East, was to force us to acquiesce in the foundation of Israel. Whatever Israel's future is intended to be, its present function is to be an *agent provocateur*, to put out of action our vital interest. And that should ensure our downfall.

We won't get out of this without a fight. But this time, if we don't fight on the real issues, our end appears to be certain.

We have to fight Zionism, *as such*. That means breaking the power of money, and getting the Jews out of Palestine.

On those terms—but, so far as we can see, only on those terms—we have probably a reasonable hope of success. We would regain the lost good-will of the Arabs, and find much more world support than controlled propaganda allows us to believe.

"Mr. Dulles' recent operation seems to have done nothing to remove the blinkers from his eyes. Last week-end he made the peculiar statement that the situation in the Middle East was now much more conducive to peace than a month ago, completely overlooking the fact that all that has happened was that the flash-point has moved northwards from Suez to Syria. . . .

" . . . The Syrian puppets are alleging that mass Israeli, Iraqi, Turkish, British and French troop concentrations are taking place on the Syrian frontiers, preparatory to an attack. Moscow has taken up this cry and has informed America that Russia was ready to take action 'in defence of Syria's freedom and independence.' . . .

" . . . The stage is therefore set for the showdown which almost came over Suez. Russia has, in fact, been given fair warning that this will be the showdown, with the most powerful countries of Islam this time ranged with the

West. They are, in fact, in the vanguard. This is a situation which only a failure of recent Soviet diplomacy in the Middle East has brought about. . . ."

—*Time and Tide*, December 8, 1956.

We don't think the Russians or their backers in New York care how many Arabs kill each other, so long as it cuts off Western Europe's oil.

A correspondent raises a question of major interest: he asks, in effect, whether the present situation is really urgent.

The problem we have to solve is to determine "the point of no return." To take the simplest case: if two countries only are opposed to each other, the strategical problem is quite simple: positively, to gain an advantage, decisive if possible, over the opponent; negatively, to guard against such a contingency. If the positive aim succeeds, the objective of strategy is achieved without war, and the point at which that objective can just be achieved without war, represents, from the point of view of the losing country, the point of no return. But near that point, there is the maximum probability of war.

The situation in which we are involved, however, is not a *simple* one of our country against another. Put in the shortest way, we are opposed by a concealed enemy who is using every resource of perverted power and cunning to carry us beyond the point of no return, without our being aware of the fact. The whole object of his strategy is to ensure that when the situation appears recognisably urgent, it will in fact be beyond redemption.

To us the combined threat of Russian and American sanctions, military and economic, together with the obviously sedulously organised 'moral' disapprobation of most of the world, are an indication that we are in the vicinity of the point of no return in this Suez crisis. A fundamental law of mechanics, "action and reaction are equal and opposite," cannot, of course, be applied without qualification to politics. It is almost certainly not true to say that the importance of an action can be judged by the magnitude of the reaction to it, since many political actions of major importance have produced hardly any perceptible reaction. But it probably *is* true that a major reaction, such as the reaction to the Anglo-French intervention in Suez, is a measure of the magnitude in importance of that action.

The essence of the strategy of the enemy is to divert our preparations to meet the false emergency, in the expectation that the real emergency will bring us down by surprise. The real situation is not the threat of war, but the consummation of conspiracy.

"I see from Reuter's telegram that Balfour has made the Zionist declaration against which I fought so hard . . . The Government has dealt an irreparable blow at Jewish Britons . . . they have alarmed unnecessarily the Mohammedan world, and insofar as they are successful, they will have a Germanised Palestine on the flank of Egypt."

—Edwin Samuel Montague, Secretary of State for India, in his Diary, November 11, 1917: quoted in *T.S.C.*, December 30, 1944.

Social Credit and Suez

The article under this title, which appeared in our previous two issues, is now available in pamphlet form, price 3d.

THE DEVELOPMENT OF WORLD DOMINION—

(continued from page 1.)

Considered as an approach to war in perpetuity, it appears difficult to imagine a more ingratiating line of thought.

In this connection (and the connection is close), *Le Matin*, on April 18, 1936, is worthy of recall. "One cannot even compare the League of Nations to the language of Æsop," is observed, "because in the language of Æsop there was good and bad, whilst in the League of Nations there is only bad. The League has not improved upon the methods of the old diplomacy, but it has added to them verbiage, trickery, and the washing of dirty linen in public. It has not diminished the number of international differences, but it has aggravated their importance, bringing into play solidarities which complicate everything and prevent nothing. It is not a conservatorium of peace, but a game of grab. It is not a garden, but a wilderness." (February 3, 1945.)

It is a most unfortunate, but not the less incontrovertible fact, that only a very small minority is able to say what it means, to ask for what it wants, or to recognise it when it gets it. This fact, simple as it is, lies very near to the root of the world's troubles, because it provides the background for the *Fuehrerprinzip*—a perversion of functional hierarchy into the region of political absolutism. "Big Business as Government."

An instance of this is the growing condonation of trespass, in the general as well as the more conventional sense. "Property" simply means decentralised sovereignty.

A man who "owns" a small business in a regime of *genuine* private ownership, is sovereign in that business. The political power of ownership is almost entirely a financial perversion. Every intrusion, whether by a Trades Union or a bureaucrat representing a State or Local Authority, is a trespass—whether legalised or not is largely immaterial. Socialism, of course, is legalised trespass carried to its logical conclusion—all sovereignty is centralised in the bureaucracy, and the individual has no "rights." Once again, it is largely immaterial to a consideration of this question whether such trespass—currently termed "sweeping away vested interests" appears to meet a functional necessity, because functional necessity is conditioned by policy. "Who wills the end, wills the means." Certain fundamental and vastly important consequences proceed from trespass as a recognised principle, and the violent reaction against it in the international arena (and all war is excused as a reaction against trespass) is for that reason certain to be reflected in domestic politics. And the further the trespass proceeds, the more violent will be the reaction. For this reason, if for no other, there is no inherent stability in Russia, and the exceptional stability of England under great provocation from financial and social injustice, has been largely due to the tenacious insistence on the principle of "rights." Hence the stealthy undermining of them from

quarters which regard "traditional" Britain as the great stumbling-block to world dominion.

It is far from accidental that "trespass" is the generic crime alone mentioned in the principal Prayer of Christianity.

It is of course easy to see that Marxian Socialism—dialectical materialism—is a tool. It is a weapon almost perfectly designed to distract attention from the imponderables—to induce the acceptance of a mess of pottage in exchange for a birthright.

Man must have bread. There is plenty of bread, or it would be necessary to conceive of the material universe as essentially evil, the Manichaeon Heresy. But if you can persuade a man that there isn't, you may be able to persuade him to give up something which, besides assuring him of bread, would eventually give him the universe. It is a terrifying truth that man has the possibility of atrophying his capacities by disuse. Man does not live by bread alone; but we can observe a steady policy directed to the end of ensuring that he either doesn't live, or regards bread and life as synonymous. Religion has always proclaimed and warned us of the danger, without perhaps defining sufficiently its nature. And it is part of the triumph of European civilisation that it has always exalted the imponderables. When Americans came to England and France in the last century, they did not come to admire our mass-production methods. They came to imbibe imponderables—the spirit of the Gothic Cathedrals, the chateaux of the Loire, or even the changing of the Guard. Those are the things which are being attacked, just as Cromwell attacked them, and the modern argument is that they stand in the way of bread. It is a cosmic lie. (January 27, 1945.)

It is always important, but it never was more important than now, to observe "the thing in itself," rather than its name. It is no use whatever merely driving out the bureaucrats into Imperial Chemical Industries and the Co-operative Wholesale Society. What, on peril of extinction, we have to re-establish is genuine alternative service. Monopoly is the thing in itself; and centralised control of any kind is the essence of it. (January 27, 1945.)

It is commonly, and, in the main, truthfully observed that all politicians are rogues. But the observers usually stop at that. Their perspicacity should take them further. They should see that a system gets the leaders it deserves. The fact that Russia has almost the finest collection of rogues in high places, extant, ought to induce comparison with Germany, which seems to top the bill. But it does look as though we were proposing in this country (England) to enter the roguery stakes in a big way. (February 3, 1945.)

"Any people, anywhere, being inclined and having the Power, have [sic] the right to rise up and shake off the existing Government and form a new one that suits them better. This is a valuable, a most sacred right—a right which we hope and believe is to liberate the world."

—Abraham Lincoln.

So he fought the bloodiest civil war in history up to that date, to prevent the Southern States from exercising their "most sacred right." (January 20, 1945.)

At the C.C.F. (Socialist) Conference in Montreal on December 1, an effort was made to include in the programme of the party "the complete and final severance of Canada from Great Britain." Mr. Caldwell, the Leader of the Party, was born in England, and is in close touch with the London School of Economics. We are not responsible for him, but we apologise.

The downfall of the British Empire has been the steady objective of international intrigue, of which Socialism is one limb, and High Finance another, during at least one hundred years. It has been said of Great Britain that she acquired an Empire in a fit of absence of mind, and many people, and more especially American and German Jews, translate "absence of mind" by "paucity of intellect."

But, in fact, it is not difficult to prove that whatever its genesis, the genius of Great Britain, which to some extent has extended to the countries linked by the Crown, is insistence on the importance of quality as compared with quantity. Parenthetically, we have no doubt whatever that a return to that principle is the only hope of survival of British culture.

Socialism is an assertion of the importance of quantity and the irrelevance of quality.

Since International Finance is determined to be the only fount of honour as well as the Permit Office for bed, board and clothes, British culture is incompatible with its aims, and it has, in fact, already been driven underground. The effective policy of Great Britain at the moment is that of the big cosmopolitan industrialists, the banks and the Trades Unions, all of whom hate the traditional independence of thought, which distinguished the natives of these islands, much more than they hate Germany. That is why Mr. Montagu Norman has retired with a peerage after collaboration with Dr. Schacht to build up "Hitler."

"Nationalisation (Socialism)? we welcome it."

Even in production and manufacturing, Socialists and Financiers dislike a policy of quality first. One of our ineffable Socialist Ministers, Dr. Hugh Dalton, hardly attained office before sponsoring "utility" clothing of the slop-shop standard, which no rank and file Socialist will wear, and "utility" furniture which has sent up the price of other kinds to black market levels.

Anyone who wishes to obtain a "pre-view" of the kind of civilisation to which these gentlemen wish to reduce us with the help of the Russian myth, as propagated by the "B."B.C. and the Communist propaganda in the factories, should read "Report on the Russians" by the American journalist, William L. White, which is appearing in abbreviated form in *The Readers Digest*. But, of course, Russia is scheduled for the greatest internal explosion in all history, although perhaps not just yet. Two hundred millions of people will not tolerate a penitentiary such as the Soviet regime when they have seen anything else. The emergence of the ordinary Russian into a Europe which still contains the remains of civilisation is probably the most important event of our times. But at the moment she is framing up for war with America. (January 27, 1945.)