

THE SOCIAL CREDITER

FOR POLITICAL AND ECONOMIC REALISM

Vol. 35. No. 3.

SATURDAY, FEBRUARY 9, 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.

It ought to be clear without much elaboration that the 1914-1918 and 1939-1945 (?) War had as its primary objective, a World Government. There is every evidence that the League of Nations was a primary excitant to war, just as its double, U.N.O., is doing more to make peace impossible than any other single factor at the moment. Now, it is absurd to say the majority of people want either war or Uno—the reaction against both is increasingly violent.

Where is the pressure coming from? Dr. Alfred Nossig, the distinguished Jewish author of *Intergrales Fudentum* supplies what appears to be an almost complete answer:

"The modern Socialist movement is in great part the work of the Jews, who impress on it the mark of their brains; it was they who took a prepondering part in the directing of the first Socialist Republic, although the controlling Jewish Socialists were mostly far from Judaism [?] The present world Socialism forms the first step of the accomplishment of Mosaism, the start of the realisation of the future state of the world announced by our prophets. It is not till there shall be a League of Nations; it is not till its Allied Armies shall be employed in an effective manner for the protection of the feeble that we can hope that the Jews will be able to develop without impediment in Palestine, their national State; and equally it is only a League of Nations penetrated with the Socialist spirit that will render possible for us the enjoyment of our international necessities, as well as our national ones. . . ."

It would be easy to be flippant about this extract; instead, we commend it to the most serious attention. It is a clear indication of the magnitude of the world's danger: (February 23, 1946.)

Nothing in the history of literature is more remarkable than the nineteenth-century reputation of Thomas Carlyle, who, with his *Frederick the Great* and *French Revolution* has done much to poison the wells of history. It is probable that a knowledge of the influences which worked to build up his absurd prestige would throw a good deal of light on current events. (March 3, 1945.)

What a racket, and how it's lasted! Frederick of Prussia, written up by Carlyle, Engels the millionaire-child-exploiter and his ghost-writer Marx, Bismarck, Ballin, Rathenau, the Chemical Cartel, the big industrialists and the ambitious bureaucrats and Trades Union officials. "We're all Socialists now." Many colossal fortunes, thousands of considerable estates, publishers, and price rings, all working with the international finance racket to benefit "der gommon beople." Well, it's been a marvellous game, but we think it's nearly finished. Mr. Emanuel (God with us) Shinwell is showing the way to go home. (March 3, 1945.)

There is a theory, which is not so fantastic as it might appear at first sight, that all emotion, as well as ideation, is external to us, and that we stand in relation to it much as a telephone exchange operator, who can plug in on any line desired; with the difference, however, that most of us are asleep, and do not exercise conscious control over our "calls."

We are led to recall this hypothesis of observation of the widespread prevalence of sadism, ranging from outright cruelty to much more subtle forms of trouble-making; as though the devil's wave-band were so powerful and so close that an abnormal number of receivers picked up the vibrations. One very noticeable form in which this activity is abroad can be met in nearly every legislative effort. Nearly always, the proposal is to take something off individuals, by taxation, restriction or prohibition. If one is to judge by mere noise, whether transmitted by the "B."B.C. or otherwise, there is immense enthusiasm for making everyone poor, and no articulate desire to increase the number of persons who are "rich," even if that number comprised the total population. It is not a pretty phenomenon, even from the moral point of view. But as a political religion, it is nothing less than deadly, and only requires to be pursued over a few short years to ensure the collapse of the nation on which it takes root. It will be remembered that, when accused of responsibility for the economic crisis, Mr. Montagu Norman is said to have replied, "I do not think it is good for a nation to be prosperous." He now has many imitators. (February 17, 1945.)

(Continued on page 4.)

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.*

The Social Credit Secretariat

At Dr. Basil Steele's invitation, Mr. John Baird has accepted the post of Director of Revenue of The Social Credit Secretariat in the United Kingdom. For the convenience of readers who wish to communicate with Mr. Baird, his address is 30, Aberdare Gardens, London, N.W.6.

Notice

Among the material from *The Social Crediter* necessarily omitted in the process of condensing two weekly issues into one since Christmas are extracts from the House of Lords Debate on Suez on December 11 last, notably speeches by Lord Bruce of Melbourne and Lord Cherwell. Both were directed to the vital question of U.N.O., its real status and sufficiency to play the part ostensibly designed for it.

Social Crediters in the United Kingdom who are anxious to capitalise the long years of preparation for this critical moment and to add to their equipment by keeping abreast of current events are advised to study available reports of this Debate, and, particularly, of the speeches mentioned above.

We thank those of our readers who have responded nobly to the Secretariat's appeal for donations, and would ask those who have not done so, and particularly those whose subscriptions and donations are in arrear, to consider carefully the matter sent to them by post. Action on their part is as essential as the lead provided by the Social Credit Secretariat.

Cheques and postal orders in payment of subscriptions to *The Social Crediter* should be made payable to K.R.P. Publications, Ltd., and crossed. Donations should be made payable to the Social Credit Secretariat and crossed.

From Week to Week

The Manchester Guardian, January 10, 1957, reports an address by Mr. Julian Amery, M.P., to the Council of Europe's Assembly on January 9. "The milestones of the progressive elimination of British influence from the Middle East had been Palestine, Abadan, and the Canal Zone. Let no one believe that we have been driven out by the bombs of the Stern gang, the tears of Mussadiq, or the terrorism of Nasser. It was the pressure and influence of the United States that were decisive.

" . . . It was American fear of British imperialism which led President Roosevelt to refuse Churchill's plan for liberating Europe from the South-east. The result was the

loss of all East Europe to the free world. Roosevelt supported Chiang Kai-shek against the French and British interests, in Shanghai and throughout China. . . .

"There was the American threat of economic sanctions. There was the strange behaviour of the United States Sixth Fleet. More recently at the Congressional hearings the day before yesterday, Mr. Dulles spoke of the Anglo-French operations in terms of sarcasm which would have been natural in the mouth of Marshal Bulganin. . . ."

A near miss, Mr. Amery.

Consider the statement made in 1917 by Dr. Weizmann of the Zionist Organisation: "One of these *intermediate stages* which I hope is going to come about as the result of the war is that the fair country of Palestine will be protected by such a mighty power as Great Britain. Under the wing of this power, Jews will be able to *set up and develop the administrative machinery which . . . would enable us to carry out the Zionist scheme . . .*" (Our emphasis.)

The crux of the international situation is the "Zionist scheme"; the United States is the vehicle of Zionist policy, and so is the U.S.S.R. That is why, as someone put it, America and Russia are holding hands under the table.

The behaviour of America as our "ally" is, as it is frequently characterised, 'mistaken' to the point of stupidity. But the behaviour of America as a tool of Zionist policy is consistent and effective. The Zionist "scheme" is world dominion for Israel, and all would-be world conquerors have recognised the absolute necessity of eliminating Great Britain before world dominion can be achieved.

To adapt General Ludendorff: "The British do not understand that the Jews have got to disappear as a World Power." The power of the Jews, at the moment, is still primarily money-power; but the arrangements to substitute police-power are rapidly approaching finality. The first step to breaking Jewish power, at the moment, is the adoption of a realistic economic policy—essentially, the repudiation of the gold-dollar financial 'standard,' the substitution of honest for dishonest book-keeping, and the utilisation of the Empire's resources to promote a consumer's economy. But Mr. Macmillan is not the man to do that.

It is quite certainly the case that our survival depends on our recognition of the existence and effect of Zionist policy in international affairs; and perhaps as good a starting point as any is the observation by General Ludendorff, that the British do not understand that having served their turn with the inner circle of Jews, they had to be eliminated as a world power.

The primary weapon of the Jew is money-power. Money is a licence to act; almost all actions of individuals, and all actions of nations, are licensed by the provision of the necessary finance. The policy of the inner circle of Jews, therefore, is made effective by selective financing.

"Wars are the Jews' harvest." The licensing of Germany on two occasions, to make war on Europe and Great Britain, were two attempts by the inner circle of Jews to destroy Great Britain. And the financial shackles imposed virtually exclusively on Great Britain, following both military attempts, were, and are, simply the pursuit of the same

policy by other means.

It should be remembered that it was Great Britain which led the world in industrialisation, and, in the early part of that period, actually industrialised a good deal of the world. The continuous further harnessing of power since then, accelerated by both wars, has physically enriched us still more, and it is only carefully contrived financial arrangements leading to a vast unrequited stream of exports which hides that fact. If the trading affairs of the country were presented to the people as a Board of Directors should report to the shareholders of a company, it would be quite apparent that successive Governments should be gaoled for fraud. The real value of what we have parted with is vastly in excess of the real value of what we have received. And, as the mechanism of our final ruin, it is intended that we go on doing this until we are physically prostrated.

The existence of the State of Israel is concrete evidence of the existence of a Zionist policy. But that the Zionist Money-power has remained in New York is evidence that Zionist policy means more than the mere provision of a National Home for the Jews. This, of course, is what the Arabs know.

"Far back in ancient times we were the first to cry among the masses 'Liberty, Equality, Fraternity' . . .

"In all corners of the earth the words 'Liberty, Equality, Fraternity' brought to our ranks, thanks to our blind agents, whole legions who bore our banners with enthusiasm. . . . And all the time these words were . . . at work boring into the well-being of the *goyim*, putting an end everywhere to peace, quiet, solidarity, and destroying all the foundations of the *goya* States. . . . On the ruins of the natural and genealogical aristocracy of the *goyim* we have set up the aristocracy of our own educated class headed by the aristocracy of money."

—*The Protocols of the Learned Elders of Zion*, No. 1.

"For seven years, the statesmen and the people of the West failed to see the obvious, failed to understand the threat to their civilisation, and to eliminate it while it could still be done at a relatively small price. . . . As if acting under a curse, the various nations and political parties, Right and Left, however opposed their policies were in other respects, seemed to collaborate to bring about Europe's destruction. The attitude of the Conservative forces ranged from inane misconceptions of the nature of Hitler's regime to passive sympathy and active complicity. The various Socialist and Labour parties indulged in rhetorical denunciations of the Fascist danger, and did everything in their power to prevent their countries from arming against it. . . .

"It is doubly painful to write about these seven years at a time when the mood of the West is bent on repeating the same suicidal errors. . . ."—Koestler, *Op. cit.*

That the reiterated charge that the U.S. has no policy in the Middle East is nonsense is conclusively demonstrated by the "Eisenhower Doctrine." U.S. policy has been to get the British out; and if Congress yields to Mr. Eisenhower's request for U.S. military forces, the U.S. State Department will be able to use those forces to keep the British out, without their use for that purpose being subject

to debate in Congress. There is mounting evidence that a significant part of American public opinion is uneasy concerning the State Department's policy in the Suez crisis, an uneasiness that is likely to increase with future developments. But the "Eisenhower Doctrine" will make that public opinion considerably less effective.

"The causes which led to these upheavals [the Gladiators' War 71-73 B.C.] had an equally familiar ring: the breakdown of traditional values, a rapid transformation of the economic system, mass unemployment caused by the importation of slave labour and cheap corn from the colonies, the ruin of the farmers and the growth of a large latifundia, a corrupt administration and a decadent ruling class, a falling birth-rate and a spectacular rise in divorces and abortions . . . all the elements of what Marxists call 'an objective revolutionary situation' were assembled.

" . . . The sources gave no indication of the programme or common idea that held the Slave Army together; yet a number of hints indicated that it must have been a kind of 'socialist' programme which asserted that all men were born equal, and denied that the distinction between free men and slaves was part of the natural order; there were further hints that at one time Spartacus had tried to found a Utopian colony, founded on common property. . . . Now such ideas were entirely alien to the Roman proletariat before the advent of primitive Christianity . . . I thus assumed, for the purposes of my jig-saw puzzle, that among the numerous cranks, reformers and sectarians whom his horde must have attracted, Spartacus chose as his mentor and guide a member of the Judaic sect of Essenes. . . ."

—Arthur Koestler, *The Invisible Writing*.

Big Government

"Granting that many in the Department are devoted to their work, and loyal to the American tradition, there are others, says Mr. Barron, 'in posts of influence,' who may be described as:

- 'eager one-worlders and international socialists;
- 'bureaucrats who have developed a contempt for the man on the street and a disdain for the men on Capitol Hill;
- 'left-wingers and former Communists;
- 'Officials who are indebted to former administrations;
- 'officers who, while abroad, lost touch with the homeland;
- 'men of foreign birth, raised and educated abroad;
- 'political hacks who know little of foreign affairs;
- 'personal favourites of top officials;
- 'and the Alger Hiss type.

"The book is largely devoted to the theme that there is more than a sprinkling of such characters in the Department, and that they wield much influence in the shaping of our foreign policy. One long chapter is given to the Hiss case, not to repeat what is common knowledge but to show how a man of that type and persuasion can work his way into the top echelons of government. Hiss is merely a symbol. . . .

"But, does the President really make policy, single-handed? . . .

"Even so, the President cannot consult with all the

head bureaucrats of his business—there are too many of them—and he is reduced to consulting with his immediate entourage, the Palace Guard, through whose wisdom the accumulated advice of his experts has been sifted. It is upon the shoulders of this small group that he must lean in shaping the policy he finally enunciates. It is their policy, not his; he simply takes the responsibility for it. In shaping the policy they present to him they would be more than human if they were not influenced by personal and political considerations. . . .

“That is what we are coming to in this country—Government by an entrenched bureaucracy. Given Big Government, nothing else is possible.”

—From a discussion of Big Government, based on a book, *Inside the State Department* by Bryton Barron, by Frank Chodorov in *Human Events* (Washington), January 6, 1957.

U.S.A. and U.N.O.

In a bitter, savage attack on the United Nations and the U.S., the editor-in-chief of the *Sunday Express* (Mr. John Gordon) yesterday blamed “Nasser-loving Mr. Dag. and his big boss Eisenhower” for the continued blockage of Suez.

“They thought that once Britain had been slapped down the pacification of Nasser would be an easy business,” Gordon said.

“But what happened?”

“Nasser, swollen to cinerama size, blares boastfully over his radio that, as he has vanquished the two greatest Powers in Europe, he is no longer bound by agreements he made with the United Nations.

“The Canal, he says, apparently with Hammarskjold’s approval, can be cleared only on his terms—and he is not in a hurry to see the job started.”

Mr. Gordon said that if Col. Nasser refused free passage of the Canal to British ships the interests of the American oil monopolies would be served admirably.

Britain would have to pay more dollars for American oil.

Mr. Gordon continued: “Poor deluded Mr. Eisenhower now finds himself in a dilemma, having to ask Congress to give him power to do what he lambasted Britain for doing—use his troops to attack an enemy, if he thinks it necessary, without asking anyone’s permission.

“I hope the thought of it isn’t spoiling his game this week-end on the Augusta golf course, where America’s Government now seems to be permanently established.”

—*The Daily Mirror*, Sydney, December 31, 1956.

Social Credit and Suez

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

12 copies @ 2/6. 24 copies @ 4/6.

50 copies @ 8/-. 100 copies @ 15/-.

From K.R.P. PUBLICATIONS, LTD.,

11, GARFIELD STREET, BELFAST.

THE DEVELOPMENT OF WORLD DOMINION—

(continued from page 1.)

It might be supposed that Social Credit had little or nothing to do with the Palestinian question. So far from this being the case, it is probable that Palestinian Zionism, in its present form at least, on the one hand, and both the philosophy and technique of Social Credit on the other, are absolute incompatibles. Many of the reasons for this would require lengthy elaboration; but the two main principles involved are easy to state briefly. By the “nationalisation” of the Bank of “England,” contemporaneously with the accession of a Socialist Governmental Administration which is Jewish both in inspiration and support, the control of world financial credit can be, and is being, centralised in a Jewish monopoly with monopolistic powers of bribery. As an instance of this, the Jews in Palestine are “paying” an average of *four hundred dollars* (one hundred pounds) an acre for indifferent land.

The price of much better land in this country is about twenty depreciated paper pounds per acre. These prices can be paid, of course, because in the last resort it will be the English who will provide the money.

And the second factor of decisive importance is that *for the first time in the Christian era*, the Jews are faced with the threat of war as Jews. If war breaks out in the Near East, as it easily may do, the fighting will doubtless, as usual, involve Jewish employee nations; but the protagonists will be Jews and Muslims.

We propose, therefore, to keep this subject as far as possible in its accurate perspective. (May 25, 1946.)

• • •

Nothing is more remarkable than the contrast between the claims made for “Progress” both scientific and political and the steady degradation of human life. The phenomenon is analogous to, and in fact is part of the passive acceptance in the United States, in October, 1929, of an overnight transition from abounding prosperity to economic collapse. The innate absurdity of supposing that a world which was capable of supplying every luxury on October 29, 1929, could be “ruined” on November 1, is of the same nature as the claim that a nation which could fight the most devastating war in all history without suffering from lack of food, should on the cessation of hostilities take every possible measure to interfere with the processes by which it had previously lived. When, in consequence, not of war but of legislation, an alleged famine threatens, every explanation is adduced except the true explanation, that real credit—“the correct estimate or belief in the capacity of society to produce and deliver goods and services, *as, when, and where* required”—is breaking down.

We are in the hands of a gang of crooks utilising a pack of conceited careerists; and everyone knows it and is bored with the game. Ability to produce is greater than ever; but why should we? Don’t tell us, because “ye are of your father the devil . . . abode not in the truth, for there is no truth in him . . . he is a liar, and the father of it.”

(May 25, 1946.)