

THE SOCIAL CREDITER

FOR POLITICAL AND ECONOMIC REALISM

Vol. 56 No. 11

NOVEMBER-DECEMBER, 1977

A Prophecy?

It is, we think, timely to reprint the following which appeared in these pages fourteen years ago.

In the year 1787 the Bavarian Government published in Munich the text of documents which had been seized in a raid on a secret society known to themselves as the Illuminati. These documents contained a plan for the overthrow of monarchies and the disruption of the existing order of society. This was to be accomplished by means of economic crises, spiritual demoralisation, and moral corruption. There is evidence, however, that the raid on the Illuminati did not bring their activities to an end; many features of the French Revolution bear witness to the machinations of the Illuminati, or of a related or descendant group.

In a book, *Secret Societies and Subversive Movements* (p. 258 *et seq.*), now difficult to obtain, N. Webster gives a number of extracts from the published documents which have an extraordinary relevance to events of our own day. What came to light in the Profumo affair is but scum on the surface of a cesspool; but that scum pointed clearly enough to contrivance, for high political purposes, behind the scenes.

There have been other references, from time to time, by highly placed personages, to an awareness of occult influences underlying apparently spontaneous events, and over the years such references bring out the continuity of these influences.

But on August 10, 1906, there was deposited in the British Museum a copy of a document published in Russia in 1905. It has been suggested that this document was "leaked" by Lenin. It details a plan of subversion, corruption and revolution which quite parallels that disclosed in the documents seized from the Illuminati, but does so in much greater detail, and has regard to developments in the world since the days of the Illuminati.

We purposely refrain from a discussion of the origin of this document, since its authenticity is vouched for by the prior existence of the Illuminati documents. There is only one useful course to be followed, and that is to examine the conspiracy expounded in this, the latest occult form known to us, in the light of the events of the twelve years following 1905 and of all the years since. We divide the period thus because the Communist Revolution seized control of Russia in 1917.

The conspiracy in its various incarnations falls into two parts: the overthrow of existing society, its institutions and culture; and the establishment and extension of revolutionary government by means of an unprecedented tyranny. And this brings us to the interesting point that the ideas of the Illuminati are to be found in the writings of Lenin and Stalin, no longer secret but victorious.

When the 1905 version of the conspiracy was published in Great Britain, there was sufficient congruence with the events of those days to cause a good deal of alarm in informed quarters. There was much in the conspiracy, however, which

was not then actualised, and might have appeared far-fetched. But steadily since then, and in a sharply accelerating manner since the Second World War, the area of congruence has spread, aided of course by technological development particularly in the fields of communications and control which could hardly have been even imagined seventy years ago. The world has changed far more in the life-time of a contemporary septuagenarian than it changed in centuries before our era.

It is tempting to make a running commentary on the extensive extracts of the documents we propose to publish.^[*] There is no need. It is high time they spoke for themselves to this day and age. Let no one accuse us of forgery. We disclaim the ability to concoct so detailed and exact a description of what is happening before our eyes. But this is no description. It is either a prophecy or a detailed plan of campaign; strategy and tactics to carry forward a coherent policy, glimpses of which, to the accompaniment of turmoil and disaster, have appeared down the centuries.

THE EXTRACTS

(Footnotes are ours)

... Putting aside fine phrases we shall speak of the significance of each thought: by comparisons and deductions we shall throw light upon surrounding facts.

What I am about to set forth, then, is our system from the two points of view, that of ourselves and that of the *goyim*.

It must be noted that men with bad instincts are more in number than the good, and therefore the best results in governing them are attained by violence and terrorisation, and not by academic discussions. Every man aims at power, everyone would like to become a dictator if only he could, and rare indeed are the men who would not be willing to sacrifice the welfare of all for the sake of securing their own welfare.

What has restrained the beasts of prey who are called men? What has served for their guidance hitherto?

In the beginnings of the structure of society they were subjected to brutal and blind force; afterwards—to Law, which is the same force, only disguised. I draw the conclusion that by the law of nature right lies in force.

Political freedom is an idea but not a fact. This idea one must know how to apply whenever it appears necessary with this bait of an idea to attract the masses of the people to one's party for the purpose of crushing another who is in authority. This task is rendered easier if the opponent has himself been infected with the idea of freedom, so-called liberalism, and, for the sake of an idea, is willing to yield some of his power. It is precisely here that the triumph of our theory appears; the slackened reins of government are immediately, by the

* For our present purpose we shall confine ourselves to a small selection of the extracts. The complete extracts are available in the booklet *A Prophecy?* available from Tidal Publications in Australia and K.R.P. Publications Ltd., in England.

law of life, caught up and gathered together by a new hand, because the blind might of the nation cannot for one single day exist without guidance, and the new authority merely fits into the place of the old already weakened by liberalism.

In our day the power which has replaced that of the rulers who were liberal is the power of Gold*. Time was when Faith ruled. The idea of freedom is impossible of realisation because no one knows how to use it with moderation. It is enough to hand over a people to self-government for a certain length of time for that people to be turned into a disorganised mob. From that moment on we get internecine strife which soon develops into battles between classes, in the midst of which States burn down and their importance is reduced to that of a heap of ashes.

Whether a State exhausts itself in its own convulsions, whether its internal discord brings it under the power of external foes—in any case it can be accounted irretrievably lost: *it is in our power*. The despotism of Capital, which is entirely in our hands, reaches out to it a straw that the State, willy-nilly, must take hold of: if not—it goes to the bottom.

Should anyone of a liberal mind say that such reflections as the above are immoral I would put the following questions:—If every State has two foes and if in regard to the external foe it is allowed and not considered immoral to use every manner and art of conflict, as for example to keep the enemy in ignorance of plans of attack and defence, to attack him by night or in superior numbers, then in what way can the same means in regard to a worse foe, the destroyer of the structure of society and the common-wealth, be called immoral and not permissible?

Is it possible for any sound logical mind to hope with any success to guide crowds by the aid of reasonable counsels and arguments, when any objection or contradiction, senseless though it may be, can be made and when such objection may find more favour with the people, whose powers of reasoning are superficial? Men in masses and the men of the masses, being guided solely by petty passions, paltry beliefs, customs, traditions and sentimental theorism, fall a prey to party dissension, which hinders any kind of agreement even on the basis of a perfectly reasonable argument. Every resolution of a crowd depends upon a chance or packed majority, which, in its ignorance of political secrets, puts forth some ridiculous resolution that lays in the administration a seed of anarchy.

The political has nothing in common with the moral. The ruler who is governed by the moral is not a skilled politician, and is therefore unstable on his throne. He who wishes to rule must have recourse both to cunning and to make-believe. Great national qualities, like frankness and honesty, are vices in politics, for they bring down rulers from their thrones more effectively and more certainly than the most powerful enemy. Such qualities must be the attributes of the kingdoms of the *goyim*, but we must in no wise be guided by them.

Our right lies in force. The word "right" is an abstract

* If there is any apparent confusion in the document we are quoting, this relates to money and the financial system. The reason for this is clear enough. Until 1917-18, when C. H. Douglas exposed the method of operation of the financial system, this system was shrouded in utter mystery; and since the power of the conspirators rested on their control of that system, as is made clear from the text, this was the one secret they were not giving away. We reproduce the original words, "gold", "capital", etc.; but if the reader substitutes, where appropriate, the words "credit" or "control of credit", the meaning will be plain enough.

thought and proved by nothing. The word means no more than:—Give me what I want in order that thereby I may have a proof that I am stronger than you ...

Our power in the present tottering condition of all forms of power will be more invincible than any other, because it will remain invisible until the moment when it has gained such strength that no cunning can any longer undermine it.

Out of the temporary evil we are now compelled to commit will emerge the good of an unshakeable rule, which will restore the regular course of the machinery of the national life, brought to nought by liberalism. The result justifies the means. Let us, however, in our plans, direct our attention not so much to what is good and moral as to what is necessary and useful.

Before us is a plan in which is laid down strategically the line from which we cannot deviate without running the risk of seeing the labour of many centuries brought to nought.

In order to elaborate satisfactory forms of actions it is necessary to have regard to the rascality, the slackness, the instability of the mob, its lack of capacity to understand and respect the conditions of its own life or its own welfare. It must be understood that the might of a mob is blind, senseless and unreasoning force ever at the mercy of a suggestion from any side. The blind cannot lead the blind without bringing them into the abyss; consequently, members of the mob, upstarts from the people even though they should be as a genius for wisdom, yet having no understanding of the political†, cannot come forward as leaders of the mob without bringing the whole nation to ruin.

Only one trained from childhood for independent rule can have understanding of the words that can be made up of the political alphabet.

A people left to itself, *i.e.* to upstarts from its midst, brings itself to ruin by party dissensions excited by the pursuit of power and honours and the disorders arising therefrom. Is it possible for the masses of the people calmly and without petty jealousies to form judgments, to deal with the affairs of the country, which cannot be mixed up with personal interests? Can they defend themselves from an external foe?...

To complete the ruin of the industry of the *goyim* we shall bring to the assistance of speculation the luxury which we have developed among the *goyim*, that greedy demand for luxury which is swallowing up everything. *We shall raise the rate of wages which, however, will not bring any advantage to the workers, for, at the same time, we shall produce a rise in prices of the first necessities of life, alleging that it arises from the decline of agriculture and cattle-breeding: we shall further undermine artfully and deeply sources of production, by accustoming the workers to anarchy and to drunkenness and side by side therewith taking all measure to extirpate from the face of the earth all the educated forces of the GOYIM.*

In order that the true meaning of things may not strike the GOYIM before the proper time we shall mask it under an alleged ardent desire to serve the working classes and the great principles of political economy about which our economic theories are carrying on an energetic propaganda...

† This is a curious usage and shows great insight. It is probably best understood in the terms "the distinction between policy and administration".

The Protocols

(Originally published in *The Information Sheet*, September, 1945)

Appropriately, from Columbia University comes another 'refutation' of the *Protocols of the Learned Elders of Zion*. Although the book is called an 'appraisal,' the conclusion is not in doubt from the first page.

The bibliography lists eleven works which 'attack the authenticity of the Protocols,' as against ten which uphold it; and among the latter lists Nesta Webster's *World Revolution*. This is important, since the Foreword to *An Appraisal** states that the basic problem of the Protocols—the problem of their authenticity—is obviously an historical one, to be solved by the rigorous application of historical methods.

The text of the Protocols makes no claim to originality; on the contrary, there are various references to the antiquity of the plot which it portrays, the secrets of which are supposed to have been handed down from generation to generation within a select body of highly trained political experts, who are constantly applying to the problems of the present the solutions discovered by study and experience in the past. Now the refutation which has become standard, and which is given in Dr. Curtiss's book with artistic understatement, is the almost exact parallel existing between certain passages of the Protocols and passages of Maurice Joly's *Dialogue in Hell*, a book published in Brussels in 1865. The discovery of this 'flagrant plagiarism' was published in *The Times* (London), and brought the public sensation caused by the publication of the Protocols to an end; but a surviving interest has remained and no doubt stimulated Dr. Curtiss to write his book.

The plagiarism was discovered in 1921, the same year as Mrs. Webster published her *World Revolution*, a genuinely painstaking and carefully documented piece of research into the history of certain revolutionary ideas and their sponsors. Mrs. Webster relates that when she read the Protocols "the thought that recurred at every page was: 'Where have I read that before?' and by degrees the conviction grew: 'But this is simply Illuminism!'" And she proceeds to set out in parallel columns, just as does Dr. Curtiss with Joly's text, parallel passages of the Protocols and the texts of Illuminism—*documents a hundred years older than Joly's book*. And further on she shows striking similarities between the Protocols and certain passages in the works of Lenin and other leaders of the Russian Revolution in 1917.

A 'rigorous application of historical methods,' therefore, would require Dr. Curtiss to show from whom Joly plagiarised; but there is nothing in his book which takes the matter back further than 1865, although apparently he was acquainted with *World Revolution*.

But a historical examination of the origin of the Protocols is not an 'appraisal'; it is merely a first step. It is, however, practically the only step Dr. Curtiss takes and a mincing step it is. In 1865, there was a wide diffusion of revolutionary ideas, which can be traced both backwards and forwards, and which in not very differing forms were the property of many different people and groups.

Now what is required is a close examination of the parallelism of these ideas with actual events, and an explanation of their continuity as a set of ideas which have

appeared under a number of different auspices.

From many points of view, the publicity which the Protocols have received has been a disservice to the examination of the causes of world unrest. The programme of the Protocols may be compiled from other sources, and verified in the facts of the world, and it is literally a matter of life and death that the sponsors of that programme should be unmasked. In this, Dr. Curtiss helps not at all; he diverts attention from the main problem. And that is exactly the difficulty which is caused by the noisy 'anti-semitism' derived from an uncritical acceptance of the Protocols as what Nilus said they were.

The present position is this: It is easy to establish the existence of a world revolutionary programme, antecedent to Marx, and independently of the Protocols and of the *Dialogue in Hell*, both of which, however, embody its main features. Joly, in fact, "in his preface never claimed to have originated the scheme described in his book; on the contrary he distinctly states that it 'personifies in particular a political system which has not varied for a single day in its application since the disastrous and alas! too far-off date of its enthronement.'"¹

But it has never proved possible to establish the identity of the group ultimately responsible. The field of enquiry can, however, be narrowed, and there is a good deal of circumstantial evidence which narrows the field still further.

In the first place, any political programme which has existed for some hundreds of years with no modification other than adaption to a changing world could be maintained only by some group with a continuous cultural existence—that is to say, a group of which the individuals composing it recognised an objective transcending their own individual existences. Nations, of course, are such groups; and foreign policy is such a programme. There is no doubt in anyone's mind these days that both Germany and Japan had foreign policies aiming at world-conquest; these nations, however, included military warfare in their plans, whereas the world-conquest through revolution programme which is the actual source of the Protocols relied on subversion, corruption, and white-anting of national political institutions; and above all, it relied on secrecy, and the complete concealment of its ultimate sponsors.

In the second place, the programme is a *world* programme; it cuts across the boundaries of geographical nations as such, and in fact aims to abolish such boundaries. Now a programme—a policy—requires some form of power, sanctions of some description, if it is to be implemented. There have been up to the present only two major sanctions of international effect: international finance, and international communications, the latter including, of course, both information and propaganda. The sponsors of the programme are to be looked for, therefore, in connection with the extra-national groups controlling these sanctions.

It is not proposed here to narrow the field any further; a penetrating survey of the subject is to be found in *The Big Idea*, by C. H. Douglas.² It should be evident, however, that Dr. Curtiss's application of historical methods is anything but rigorous.

It might clear the air a good deal to agree that the Protocols are 'forgeries,' in order to concentrate on the question as to why they were brought forward as they were. From this point of view, it is far from improbable that both Joly

* *An Appraisal of the Protocols of Zion*, by Dr. John S. Curtiss: Columbia University Press: New York, 1942.

1 See N. Webster, *Secret Societies and Subversive Movements*, p.409.

2 [Now out of print.]

and Nilus, like Disraeli,³ were aware of the great programme—a programme of such magnitude as to be almost unbelievable, as incredible as the state of the world to-day, in fact. The credibility of the programme rests, indeed, on its own history, and on its parallelism to events. Those who have endeavoured to awaken people to the terrible danger have always been faced with the problem of how to bring it to public attention. Joly recognised in Napoleon III not the originator, but the agent of a policy; Nilus—or, perhaps, Rachkovskii⁴—recognised in Russia the manifestations of the programme; Disraeli spoke as one who knew of the activities of secret societies, and he hinted that he knew more than he said.

There is no question whatsoever as to the authenticity of the documents from which the Protocols as well as *A Dialogue* ultimately derive. These documents were correspondence and paper seized by the Bavarian Government and published in Munich in 1787. There is equally no question that they revealed a plot against civilisation. That the Illuminati survived their suppression has been proved by documentary evidence⁵; and that the state of the world is just as one would expect were the programme revealed still being carried on, is easily confirmed by anyone who will read the programme in any of its forms, including the Protocols. There is a mass of evidence, relating not only to contemporary events, but to individuals implicated in them, which should be assessed in a Court of Law; probably in no other way can our troubles be brought to an end.

In the meantime, we can only surmise why Dr. Curtiss so sedulously ignores the material to which his own bibliography leads him. There must be a reason. Perhaps he is going to devote a second volume to exposing Joly's plagiarism.

—B.W.M.

- 3 See, in particular, *Coningsby*; also speeches in House of Commons.
 4 See *An Appraisal*, p.70 *et seq.*
 5 Full references, and important extracts, are given by N. Webster in *Secret Societies and Subversive Movements*, p.258 *et seq.*

A PROPHECY?

30p posted

ZIMUNISM

60p posted

From K.R.P. PUBLICATIONS LTD.,

245 Cann Hall Road, London E11 3NL

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 £2.00; Six months £1.00. Airmail one year £2.70.

Offices: Business: K.R.P. Publications Ltd., 245 Cann Hall Road, Leytonstone London E11 3NL. Tel. 01-534 7395.
 Editorial: Penrhyn Lodge, 2 Park Village East, London NW1 7PX.
 Tel. 01-387 3893.

IN AUSTRALIA—

Business: Tidal Publications, Box 2318V, G.P.O., Melbourne, Victoria 3001.
 Editorial: 11 Robertson Road, North Curl Curl, N.S.W. 2099 (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, 2 Park Village East, London NW1 7PX. Telephone 01-387 3893. General Deputy Chairman and Secretary: H. A. Scouler, 11 Robertson Road, North Curl Curl, N.S.W. 2099.

THE MISSING MILLIONS

The following letter, originally dated July 7, appeared in *The Canberra Times*, July 28, 1976 and is repeated from our issue for September-October 1976.

Sir, — In a public address in defence of the existing economic system delivered in Melbourne in 1932 Professor Copland, then Dean of the Faculty of Commerce in the University of Melbourne, quoted J. M. Keynes' logical fallacy: "Let X be equal to the cost of production of all producers. Then X will also be equal to the incomes of the public." This *petitio principii* seems to have come unscathed, at least publicly, through all these years, and appears to be at the root of the current Australian Government's 'attack' on Public Enemy No. 1 — inflation.

However, reports covering the 24-hour industrial stoppage in Victoria on June 30 stated that the strike cost \$10 million in lost wages, and \$50 million in lost production. Now it is quite evident that \$10 million "incomes of the public" will not purchase \$50 million value of production. It would be an exceptionally brash economist who would claim that the missing \$40 million represented profit. The question is, what does it represent?

All modern industrial economies are deficit finances. In a fairly rapidly expanding economy (as in Australia and elsewhere in the post-war years) the deficit-finance is provided by an expansion of the money-supply through the continuing granting of loans in excess of repayments by the banking system. But there is a limit to industrial expansion, which is indicated by a virtual saturation of consumer-demand for particular categories of production. This condition is now fondly called "stagflation".

This, of course, is where Keynes came to the rescue of other economists. He advocated, and made respectable, government deficit financing (previously Balanced Budgets were a *sine qua non* of Sound Government). The new doctrine was called "pump-priming". And these days economies almost everywhere are dependent on government deficit finance, on an expanding scale.

The purpose of this letter is certainly not to raise an academic point. It is to look at the practical consequences of the situation disclosed. As is becoming obvious to mere inspection, the Australian Government's measures to "fight" inflation are merely intensifying the current economic difficulties, steadily moving towards disaster. In my opinion, certain theoreticians in and behind the Socialist Movement understand this situation thoroughly, and are relying on it to destroy so-called Liberalism and the private Capitalist system — this time forever. Mr Fraser's claim that the Whitlam Government was "mismanaging" the economy was a prescription for his own destruction, probably before the next elections are due, because he is clearly not "managing" any better than Whitlam & Co.

The core of the problem lies in the discrepancy between the incomes of the public and the value of production. The rectification of the problem lies in financing this discrepancy out of existence by accountancy procedures. These are a little subtle to grasp; but I should be happy to explain them to anyone who, recognising the economic breakdown, mathematically certain, towards which we are accelerating, is in a position to put them into effect.

I do not consider that this matter is any longer open to argument. I will merely make the prediction, which interested readers can verify in due course by observation, that unless there is a considerable expansion of the money-supply (the expansion from 1964 to 1974 was 161.72% — average 14.77% p.a.), unemployment will rise, and inflation progress. Borrowing from overseas, and/or increasing the export "surplus" are both forms of deficit financing. (And it ought to be obvious to anyone that importing money to buy *our own* production implies an internal shortage of purchasing-power.)

Merely expanding the money-supply will not *cure* our troubles, though it would temporarily ameliorate them, while compounding them for the future. But decreasing the money supply, which is the consequence of cuts in government expenditure, will certainly bring the Socialists back to power. And then God save us all, for the Socialists know where they are going. They were, until dismissed from government (though not from advisory positions), propelling this country into an international socialist New Order.

BRYAN W. MONAHAN,
 Red Hill.

Printed by Circular Press Ltd., Colwyn Bay