

THE SOCIAL CREDITER

FOR POLITICAL AND ECONOMIC REALISM

Vol. 48 No. 9

SATURDAY, 27 JULY, 1968

1s. 3d. Fortnightly

This "American" Business

By C. H. DOUGLAS

Originally published in THE SOCIAL CREDITER, August 17, 1940, this was the first of a series of contributions on the understanding of world politics written by Major Douglas during the war years 1939-45. It is not now so readily available as those that followed: THE BIG IDEA (1942), THE 'LAND FOR THE (CHOSEN) PEOPLE' RACKET (1943), THE PROGRAMME FOR THE THIRD WORLD WAR (1943) and, THE BRIEF FOR THE PROSECUTION (1945). For this reason it is re-published here. It will be included in a forthcoming publication of Notes from THE SOCIAL CREDITER which may be of use to readers who have not filed their copies as well as to those who are awakening to the dominance of the Conspiracy over all our lives.

JOHN KENNETH HYATT

Counselor at Law
30 Rockefeller Plaza
New York

16 July, 1940.

Major C. H. Douglas,
The Social Crediter,
12, Lord Street, Liverpool.
My dear Major Douglas,

I have been receiving for some months The Social Crediter, thru the courtesy no doubt of some kind friend. In these times it is of importance as well as interest to read the views of those in other parts of the world. However there is so much that is constructive and worth while that one can not permit oneself indefinitely to waste time on that which is not. Therefore I ask that you discontinue sending me your publication.

It indeed seems deeply regrettable at a time when English speaking people in all parts of the world should be united in thought at least in the common cause that you and your associates should be fostering feelings of antagonism by your unwarranted defamations of the The United States which you have the poor taste to mail to us in this country. Your reference in the June 29th issue to the German-Jew-American Crooks is disgusting and your remark that in three months (of the last war) Germany was decisively defeated is stupid. If it were true, what depths of degradation and impotence these two great nations have sunk to in twenty-five years!

Very truly yours,

John Kenneth Hyatt.

The letter which is reproduced above seems to me to afford an opportunity to deal faithfully with a matter which I believe to be perhaps more important than any other at the moment. As it was not marked "Private" and, in spite of the form of address, I am not aware of having met Mr. John Kenneth Hyatt, I feel sure he will not object to the publicity thus given to it. I hope that his, to me, unknown benefactor will continue to send him this journal until he has had an opportunity to consider what I am about to say.

In the first place, I quite understand that Mr. Hyatt is annoyed. Regarding him as a typical decent American (of

whom I know, and like, hundreds) I should expect him to be annoyed. Obviously I intended him to be annoyed.

Because the point I am endeavouring to make to him, not, it would seem, without success, is that, writing as I am doing at this moment within sound of falling bombs, and only a few miles from where the flower of Europe, and in my opinion, of the World, is engaged in mutual extermination, it does not really interest me that "English speaking people in all parts of the world should be united in thought at least in the common cause". I don't think the common cause (by which I mean his, and mine, not that of the U.S. or other Government) is going to be furthered by that kind of thought.

Because I think that certain powerful influences in the United States with confederates in Europe, and particularly in Germany, but not excluding England, are directly responsible for this war, I am equally convinced that it is the business of Mr. Hyatt and those Americans like him, to realise that, while as individuals they would repudiate that accusation, they are responsible for the policy of their Government, and must be judged by it, even if it is inspired from non-representative sources. And my practical objective is to see, to the extent of any small influence I might have, that either the Mr. Hyatts of America shoulder the responsibility for their Government's policy, and modify it, or that as many people as possible in Great Britain and the British Empire should know exactly where that unmodified policy will lead them.

Although it is not the beginning, it is quite convenient to start from Mr. Hyatt's statement that "your remark that in three months (of the last war) Germany was decisively defeated, is stupid". Passing over the fact that this is the opinion of all competent military critics, of whom, of course, I cannot claim to be one, I do not think Mr. Hyatt understands what was meant by the statement. Perhaps I may explain it to him.

All German strategy for dealing with a War on two fronts was based on the "Theory of Interior Lines", that, being inside a circle, you can get to a given point on the circumference quicker than if you are outside.

(continued on page 3)

THE SOCIAL CREDITER

FOR POLITICAL AND ECONOMIC REALISM

This journal expresses and supports the policy of the Social Credit Secretariat, which was founded in 1933 by Clifford Hugh Douglas.

The Social Credit Secretariat is a non-party, non-class organisation neither connected with nor supporting any political party, Social Credit or otherwise.

SUBSCRIPTION RATES: Home and abroad, post free: One year 40/-; Six months 20/-; Three months 10/-.

Offices: Business: 245 Cann Hall Road, Leytonstone, London E.11.

Telephone: 01-534 7395

Editorial: Penrhyn Lodge, Gloucester Gate, London NW1

Telephone: 01-387 3893

IN AUSTRALIA—

Business: Box 2318V, G.P.O., Melbourne, Victoria 3001

Editorial: Box 3266, G.P.O., Sydney, N.S.W. 2001

(Editorial Head Office).

THE SOCIAL CREDIT SECRETARIAT

Personnel—Chairman: Dr. B. W. Monahan, 4 Torres Street, Red Hill, Canberra, Australia 2603. Deputy Chairman: British Isles: Dr. Basil L. Steele, Penrhyn Lodge, Gloucester Gate, London, N.W.1. Telephone: 01-387 3893. Liaison Officer for Canada: Monsieur Louis Even, Maison Saint-Michel, Rougemont, P.Q. Secretary: H. A. Scoular, Box 3266, G.P.O., Sydney, N.S.W. 2001

FROM WEEK TO WEEK

There has been some correspondence recently in the 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 brain-washed 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".)

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 a British government embark on large-scale planning."

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

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 Skybolt 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 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

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

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.

The World After Washington

The conclusion of Major Douglas's analysis under the above title, the commencement of which appeared in our last issue, has been deferred so that his *This "American" Business* can be printed together with the current "From Week to Week" Notes.

Inflammation

I heard the other day of a mentally deficient child who was left in charge of his baby sister and gave her a box of matches to play with, inevitably causing a fire. This reminds us of British conduct towards Africa, whether Mr. Macmillan or Mr. Wilson is taken as the defective. However, it is good to hear that some Africans are far from pleased with the treatment, for Mr. Fred Mpanga wrote on June 7 (*Daily Telegraph*) that Uganda seemed an ironic choice of *venue* for the Nigeria-Biafra talks, for democracy is in "animated suspension", and force has taken over. In fact, "there is a growing feeling among the Bantu in the South that the armed minority Northerners, Dr. Obote's fellow-Nilotics, are trying to subjugate the unarmed majority in the South". The signpost, he adds, points to a similar situation to Biafra.

On June 11, Llewellyn Chanter asks, *Will Uganda go like Nigeria?* and points out that the coup of a couple of years ago resulted in the disappearance from the Uganda constitution of the four kingdoms, while the Kabaka of Buganda today lives in a dockside flat in the East End of London. After two years, "there is still a state of emergency in the Buganda Province, the greatest and most intelligent of the four. Some five former Cabinet ministers are still under arrest in the most degrading circumstances . . ." Dr. Obote has chosen repression as a means of government. He concludes, "there must be mediation now to avoid the obvious formula—genocide, secession, genocide".

But all this, together with British armament shipments to Nigeria, is taking place while the British Government is tightening up sanctions against Rhodesia and interfering with passports. And Mr. Wilson is reported to have admitted that contact has been made with African nationalists outside Rhodesia whom he calls the representatives of the majority of the people. These so-called leaders may well have been trained by communists to spread terror among Africans, who wish for peace like anyone else, and Mr. Smith has said that they represent nobody, and has rightly complained, it seems, at British implication with undesirables.

The combination of real issues in Africa, secession, war and tribalism, with Mr. Wilson's politics from a safe distance appears ludicrous enough, and he would seem to qualify as a defective child handing out matches. Yet Mr. Wilson is anything but defective in this sense, and Mr. Macmillan, who keeps cropping up, knew how to maintain his position for seven years. We do not have lunatics at the controls, but specialists in taking us in an unwanted direction. Uglier names could be imagined. In fact I met a young Army officer the other day who was changing his profession after five years owing to the run-down of the Army, and doubtless his colleagues would describe the situation vividly enough.

Meanwhile the B.B.C. gives publicity to foreign mischief-makers, claiming this to be a matter of national importance. This contrasts with the treatment it gave the responsible Mr. Ian Smith, as does the admission of these imports with the shameful confiscation of British passports. —H.S.

This "American" Business (continued from page 1)

In August, 1914, Germany confidently relied on this factor to smash France, and Great Britain's Expeditionary Force, to a time-table which would enable her to detach her Western Army to deal with the formidable force of Russia on her Eastern Front. When Von Kluck swung right at the Marne, Germany's major strategy collapsed. It was impossible for her to release sufficient men to face a Russian Army of even half the number of men of whom Russia disposed. What really happened in Russia will probably never be fully known. She was most certainly not beaten by German arms. Tannenberg was a massacre, not a battle.

What we do know is

- (a) That Mr. Walter Hines Page, American Ambassador in London, cabled to President Wilson at the outbreak of War "The British Empire is delivered into our hands", which it certainly would not have been if Germany had been defeated in six months.
- (b) That the German Embassy in the United States banked with Kuhn, Loeb & Co., of New York, and that Kuhn, Loeb did everything in their power to secure the success of Germany by the disruption of Russia. We have Jacob Schiff's own authority for this. We know that Germany quite naturally collaborated in Schiff's plans.
- (c) We have the authority of Sir Cecil Spring-Rice, British Ambassador to Washington, for the belief that President Wilson, during 1914-15-16 was almost completely controlled by Kuhn, Loeb (i.e., the Schiffs and Warburgs). Unfortunately, Sir Cecil Spring-Rice died suddenly on his way to England to report further on the matter.
- (d) We know that Great Britain and France poured munitions and equipment into Russia, none of which was allowed to reach the Armies, and that the scandal became so flagrant that Lord Kitchener and a specialist staff were deputed to go to Russia to endeavour to straighten matters out, and that the "Hampshire" on which this Mission travelled, was sunk under highly suspicious circumstances.
- (e) We know that as a result of all this, Germany was relieved of the war on two fronts, not by force of arms, but by treachery and the "Dark Forces", a

condition of affairs curiously similar to the collapse of Belgium and France in the present war. Germany then began what was, in effect, a new war, which cost millions of French and British lives.

- (f) We know that, when Britain, France, and Germany, now balanced so that a quick and decisive victory was impossible, had fought themselves to a standstill, certain terms, by which *inter alia* Great Britain *alone* underwrote the cost of the war *in gold* and, we strongly suspect, mortgaged control of the so-called Bank of England as security for a payment which never could be made, and which the United States Government knew could never be made, were agreed, and the United States entered, and won the war with comparatively negligible loss, Kuhn, Loeb co-operating. The Balfour Declaration on the Jewish Home produced the well-known American "wise crack": "We mayn't be a Monarchy, but we made Balfour an Earl, anyway".
- (g) We know that the Warburg family was represented at the Peace Conference both on the side of Germany and on the side of her military opponents.
- (h) We know that the only sane method (i.e., method of war-avoidance) of dealing with Germany at the Peace Conference was to insist that the artificial Bismarckian Reich should be broken up, and that Germany should revert to the largely independent states of which she is naturally and culturally composed. But that the whole weight of the United States was thrown against this policy, and the League of Nations, the misbegotten child of Jewish centralisation, was foisted on an unwilling and exhausted Europe, disowned by its progenitors, and left to be a convenient centre for financial and political intrigue.
- (i) We know that, in association with the "Bank of England", British policy has been dragged at the tail of Wall and Pine Street since 1917 with catastrophic results. Every attempt at rational reform, or even normal progress, has been blocked by reactionary Finance. The attempted return to the Gold Standard in 1925 under transatlantic pressure, was one instance, and the cool transfer of a loss of £42,000,000, advanced by the "Bank of England" to the Credit Anstalt *et al.*, to the Exchange Equalisation Account (i.e., the British taxpayer) was another. The grinding and unnecessary taxation on a scale unequalled outside Great Britain is another.

Had we been allowed to use the artificial depression of 1928-33 to build up our air strength, there would have been no war.

- (j) We have fairly good authority for the statement that Hitler was financed both from the United States and the "Bank of England" because he attacked "Reparations", i.e., payments to France and England on Public Account; and thus made possible the payment to Kuhn, Loeb & Co. of the very large post-war loans they had made both to Germany and German industrialists.
- (k) We know that Russia, having been reduced to scrap value, has been "reconstructed" (and how!) largely to the advantage of the German-American-Jew interest which caused her wreck.

- (1) We noticed the storm of abuse which swept the Press of the United States when, in September, 1938, it appeared barely possible that another Great War might be averted, the speeches of United States Senators, such as Senator Pittman, exhorting us that it was better to die than to live disgraced, and we have not failed to remark the assumption that the British Isles and their population don't really matter very much if the British Fleet is available to protect the American Atlantic seaboard, and so forth. We don't attach undue importance to these things but we observe them, meditatively.

Now I feel sure Mr. Hyatt will agree that there is a repetitive pattern running through the necessarily sketchy picture I have endeavoured to draw in answer to his letter. And I hasten to assure him once again that I don't imagine he, or Americans like him, are engaged in schemes of international exploitation. Nor do I suggest for one moment that the United States has a monopoly of crooks. On the contrary, we have a very flourishing Branch Office over here, many of whom, like his local brand, profess the most exalted principles.

What I am suggesting, with all the seriousness of which I am capable, is that the artless assumption that all the virtues reside in the Government of the United States for the time being, and that European Governments are something quite different, simply will not do. On the whole all Governments are rather worse in 1940 than they were in 1914, because they have become more powerful tools of "interests", and so far as Governments go, there is absolutely no ground for assuming that there is any deviation from the pattern to which I have referred, or that the chaos of the twenty years armistice would deter the "interests" from preparing the ground for more disasters.

As Mr. Chamberlain, who is so unpopular in Washington, has said, "We are fighting evil things". These evil things would be comparatively powerless if people like Mr. Hyatt and myself were not organised into increasingly powerful masses capable of being used for purposes of which we disapprove.

Let there be no misapprehension about it. We, in Great Britain, intend to win this war, which in my opinion, has been thrust upon us, and we shall be really and truly grateful for assistance to that end. But I think that I am speaking for all but an infinitesimal minority of the population when I say that we would rather go down fighting than "win" and have the terms of "Peace" imposed by Agencies, acting through Governments, which plotted the war in order to impose them, alike on the "Victors" and the Vanquished. Therefore, we intend to win the Peace, also, this time.

Further supplies of this issue are available at a nominal charge of 4d. per copy posted, but additional contributions towards costs would be appreciated.

The Big Idea (1942)

3/- posted

The 'Land for the (Chosen) People' Racket

by C. H. Douglas

2/6 posted

K.R.P. Publications Ltd., 245 Cann Hall Road, London, E.11.

Printed by E Fish & Co Ltd Liverpool