

# THE SOCIAL CREDITER

## FOR POLITICAL AND ECONOMIC REALISM

Vol. 35. No. 8.

SATURDAY, MARCH 16, 1957.

Registered at G.P.O. as a Newspaper.  
Postage: At home 2d., abroad 1d.

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.

• • •

Almost the highest attribute of man is "judgment," the exercise of choice. Far more than learning, it moulds the character and shapes the abilities, and there is no more conclusive proof of the essentially Satanic origin and nature of Socialism than its insidious and all pervasive attack on the powers of judgment and choice. We believe that it is far more this frustration of judgment than the positive hardship of the present tyranny, which is sapping the man-hood of the nation. Judgment is a faculty requiring constant exercise; and it is being killed by strangulation. "Shopping" for the love of which women used to be gently directed, was an outlet for this vital instinct. Observe the queues of weary women waiting for what the shopkeeper deigns to give them.

They are starved of "choice." (October 18, 1947.)

• • •

Between you and me, Clarence; it appears to be necessary to tell the world how thoroughly we've thought things out, and therefore how clear it is that if only we have our way, the Golden Age is upon us.

For instance (a) This racial theory is all nonsense, and must be stamped out. (b) Aren't the Russians marvellous? (a) Look what Socialism has done for the Russians. (b) It's not the German people, it's National Socialism we're fighting. (a) We demand Social Security. (b) There ought to be a lor to take it off 'im. Soak the rich. (a) An Englishman's home is his castle. (b) Compulsory billeting. (a) The coal

belongs to der beople. (b) Three times the price to what it was when it didn't, and you can't get it. (a) Nationalised electricity for everyone. (b) But you can't have it when it's cold. (a) More wahnderful motor roads coming. (b) Motor tax 30/- per horse power to encourage you to use them. (a) Scotland's being depopulated. (b) Let's turn it into a fertiliser factory to coax the population back.

Of course there are others, Clarence, but you can see for yourself that the lessons of the past twenty-five years have not been lost upon us, and with the help of the London School of Economics . . . (remainder of peroration lost in tumultuous cheers). (March 3, 1945.)

• • •

Taxation in Great Britain has increased from £3 11s. 4d. per head in 1913-14 to £65 10s. 6d. per head in 1945. At the same time the purchasing power of the pound left to the individual (not of the pounds taken by "the Government") has fallen from 20/- to about six 1913 shillings.

In thirty years, the standard of living of Great Britain has fallen from that of the highest in the world to that of the lowest, with the exception of Russia, whose standard of living outside the small inner ring of Kommissars is lower than that of fifty years ago and even the Kommissars live for the most part in houses stolen from Czarists.

The decadence of European countries is almost in direct relation to the transfer of control from individual enterprise to bureaucratic control, and (keeping the financial cause of the 1929-33 slump in detachment) the disintegration of the United States morale, which is considerable and growing, dates from "Mr. Roosevelt's" New Deal, the opposite number of P.E.P. and the outcome of carefully laid plans sponsored by Justice Brandeis, A. A. Berle, Bernard Baruch, Felix Frankfurter, Benjamin Cohen, Jr., the Morgenthau, father and son, and others of the same circle. This is the circle which brought down Czarist Russia.

(December 29, 1945.)

• • •

The Pope's Broadcast, as reported in English, gives the impression of defective translation or undue condensation; nevertheless, it displays an authentic ring of catholicity, using the word in the non-technical sense, which befits its pretensions. There is nothing new in the challenge to the limitation of the power of the state; but the circumstances in which it is repeated compel attention.

(Continued in column, 2, 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.

### From Week to Week

The defeat of Miss Leslie Greene is, we hope, a convincing demonstration of the correctness of Douglas's conviction that "If anyone is foolish enough to suppose that the prestige of this country and the Empire, and with them, the welfare of the population, can be restored by an appeal to an anonymous, irresponsible, and misinstructed ballot-box democracy, I can assure them that, if this opinion should prevail and our destinies be submitted to decision by that process, the outcome is a mathematical certainty—our final eclipse."

Nothing is to be expected of an election but the return of one of the two Parties, and nothing is to be expected from either Party but an intensification of the policy which has brought us within measurable distance of final eclipse. Measurable? Yes: the time is just the time until the installation of atomic reactors might render us independent again.

We should have thought that the demonstration of the real forces operative in international affairs afforded by the Suez crisis might by now have provided the incentive to that putting of the frame-work of our house in order to enable us to rectify both our housekeeping and our external business, which Douglas ten years ago insisted on. It is beyond question essential, and can now be seen to be essential, to replace the ballot-box system which has almost accomplished our destruction with a system which will genuinely assure our welfare.

The British have to wrest control of their own affairs from the hands of the unassimilated aliens who infest them. It is not a small task; but they must do it before they are finally disarmed.

### Jewish Socialism

"Near-millionaire Victor Gollancz, speaking on the Jewish Problem to the Left Book Club, London, said he believed there could be no permanent solution of the Jewish Problem without International Socialism."

—*Australian Jewish Herald*, January 11, 1946.

### Social Credit and Suez

12 copies @ 2/6.      24 copies @ 4/6.  
 50 copies @ 8/-      100 copies @ 15/-.

From K.R.P. PUBLICATIONS LIMITED,  
 11, GARFIELD STREET, BELFAST, N. IRELAND.

### Israel and the Arabs

In this spring of 1957 President Eisenhower and Mr. Dulles have reached a point in their Middle Eastern policy parallel to that which Sir Winston Churchill and Sir Anthony Eden had reached in the spring of 1955. The American Government has embarked, just as the British Government embarked, on a policy of meeting the Arabs and Egyptians on every matter except the only one about which Arabs and Egyptians feel deeply, the presence and pretensions of the State of Israel that has been planted in their midst.

There is a fundamental divergence of view which comes from the depths of the traditions in which the Anglo-Saxon world and the Moslem world have been reared. Britain and the United States take the existence of the State of Israel as something established and now juridically entrenched, and begin the argument from that starting point, and they are not unsympathetic when the Israelis talk of their security and vital needs, how they cannot and will not hand back the Gaza strip to be a base for raids against them, or the land around the Gulf of Aqaba to enable their enemies to blockade them again. Anyone who starts from those premises can easily conclude that the provocations come from Israeli's neighbours, and that they can fairly be asked to give guarantees that they will at any rate tolerate the new Jewish State in their midst.

Arabs and Egyptians feel quite differently—how differently is illustrated by an article this week from a correspondent who has just returned from Damascus, which also shows what very good prospects Soviet Russia has of winning the Middle East on the single issue of Israel. Communist propagandā to the Arabs points all the time to the State of Israel as the living proof that Western colonialism and imperialism are not the closed chapter which the West likes to pretend: they are living realities, an alien force which, from Britain and the United States, came and took Arab lands to give them to Jews, and passed from creating a national home to creating a sovereign State. . . .

. . . the Arab world holds Britain responsible for the presence of the Jewish State in its midst, and has never realised that the Americans are, in fact, more responsible than the British. The State of Israel was achieved by methods of terrorism against Britain, and with the full backing of American Zionism. Fundamentally the Arab instinct in directing the main feeling against Britain has a rough justice about it, for it was Britain and not the United States which started the whole business, forty years ago, although one of the great motives in starting it was to please American Jewry. . . .—*The Tablet*, February 16, 1957.

### Making Things Worse

"In his last annual statement as Chairman of the Midland Bank, Lord Harlech posed the question whether Government "management" of the national economy had made any easier the task of planning in private business. My immediate reaction to that is to assert categorically that the more the Government plans the less anyone else is able to plan. . . ."—George Schwartz in *The Sunday Times*, March 10, 1957.

## Egypt

*A further extract from the House of Lords Debate on December 11, 1956. Lord Cherwell is speaking.*

In view of the persistent use of the Veto by Russia, a procedure was introduced which was not originally contained in the Charter of the United Nations. This consisted in convoking a special meeting of the Assembly and obtaining a recommendation in the desired sense by a two-thirds majority. Though no nation was, or is, under obligation to obey such a resolution, this procedure could give a veneer of U.N.O. respectability to action which America or other nations desired to take against Russia's wishes. Now it has been invoked against us, and, of course, the considerable, and very vocal, body of people who always think England must be wrong have been howling about her delay in coming immediately to heel. Thousands of people have acted in this way because we have failed instantly to obey a resolution passed by the Assembly—a body voting on the strength of no known principle, actuated by the variegated principles which I have mentioned. I do not suppose that 1 per cent. of these people have read the Charter. If they had, they would have seen that we have never undertaken to obey the resolutions of the Assembly. I am not counting on how many occasions other nations have flouted Assembly resolutions. To do it seems to be the rule rather than the exception, and no one seems to worry very much. It is only when England fails to obey that the pack gives tongue.

The Assembly's activities in recent months raise a broad question which the Government spokesmen will no doubt be able to clear up. So far as I can see, this procedural change, namely, the agreement to call the Assembly together out of season, on the demand of seven nations, has been used to insinuate *sub silentio* a very vital change into the constitution of the United Nations as laid down in the Charter. As I have said, according to the Charter the Assembly is purely and simply a deliberative body. Provided that the Council is not dealing with it, the Assembly can discuss any matter and make recommendations. But if action is required, it must be referred to the Security Council.

... but it really shocked me that, when it was suggested in another place that the Government spokesman had in mind the protection of our oil supplies, he was greeted with boos and jeers. The Government actually, it seems, were trying to safeguard the vital interests of their country. What a terrible accusation.

It is easy for the Socialist Party, in Opposition, to take such a line. They do not seem to mind very much whether we have two or three million unemployed, and our people suffer from cold and other distresses, so long as they can blame the Government. They seem to think it quite all right that we should be at the mercy of what the noble Viscount, Lord Bruce of Melbourne, called a "tin-pot dictator"; that he should be free to impose petrol rationing and other hardships on 200 million Europeans who have spent centuries fighting for freedom from tyranny. They say that all we should do is to chant in unison the magic syllables "U.N.O., U.N.O." although they know perfectly well that it never has availed, and never will avail, to compel a nation protected by a powerful friend, preferably with a Veto, to honour its obligations. As things have developed, U.N.O. is used as

a device behind whose gimcrack façade a thief can shelter as long as he contents himself with stealing from nations which can be prevented from retaliating by one of the two great Powers.

To sum up, I do not think that U.N.O., at any rate in its present form, can work. The governing body, the Assembly, consists of a heterogeneous collection of so-called sovereign States, some of which are thousands of times more numerous than others, and tens of thousands of times more powerful and wealthy. Some of them are highly civilised; others are all but illiterate. Yet they all have an equal vote. Their decisions are given with no attempt at impartiality. They act on no known laws and have no rules of evidence. Their decisions can be enforced only if supported by at least one of the States with a store of H-bombs, provided that it is not faced with another State with an equally devastating store of weapons. Economic sanctions can be put into effect only by certain States against certain States. Others are immune. The moral force of public opinion has been proved to be utterly ineffective, even in cases of petty States like Egypt or Albania. . . .

*(To be continued.)*

---

## THE DEVELOPMENT OF WORLD DOMINION—

*(continued from page 1.)*

We are not alone in protesting against the misuse of words; and we appeal to the growing number of those who recognise what a deadly menace is contained therein to pillory the word "state" when used in any connection denoting "administration," "management" or "control."

The very essence of "state" (Latin, *status*, condition) is quiescence; and the best state is that which is most quiescent. A "State" which has issued between two and three thousand Orders-in-Council during the last four years can hardly be called quiescent. These Orders-in-Council have the force of law; and law is the framework of the State.

It must be obvious to anyone not bemused by the current manias, that a State merely requires a few massive and generally agreed laws, only changed after the greatest consideration and deliberation. It requires those laws not so much as restrictions, because in one sense all law is restrictive, but as a fulcrum against which the lever of social purpose can react. Administration by law is as fatuous as playing a game by law, which is wholly different from playing a game according to law. We have no doubt whatever that the growing lawlessness which is noticeable everywhere is an unconscious response to the perversion of the state principle. An infinity of laws is precisely equivalent to no law.

This must be what Professor Laski means when he talks about "the historic right to victory" of the Left. Water has "an historic right" to run down hill, and buildings have "an historic right" to decay. People who are competent to obtain useful results from water do not refine on the law of gravity, nor do builders hand over their plans to claimants to the discovery of perpetual motion.

Anything more intrinsically funny than to put a man with the qualifications of Sir Stafford Cripps in charge of Aircraft Production it would be difficult to conceive. Yet, so perverted is the whole conception of government, that it is quite possible that a doctrinaire Communist who doesn't

know a planing machine from a plane tree is an essential feature of the situation. (January 6, 1945.)

The key-note of the Pope's Christmas Broadcast was the limitation of the power of the State.

*The Times* compressed and paraphrased the Broadcast, and omitted any mention of the limits of the State. (January 13, 1945.)

Nothing is more remarkable than the arrogation by Labour Socialists—not by the average craftsman, who is normally tolerant—of a monopoly of civic virtue, associated with the proposition that anyone who is, or was, fairly successful in the orthodox activities of the past hundred years, unless that success was achieved as a Trades Union official or a Socialist politician, is reprehensible. We think that we have made our condemnation of certain aspects of "capitalism" fairly clear; but it has never seemed reasonable to suggest that given certain canons of society, those who fail to live under them were, *for that reason*, more admirable than those who succeeded. Almost the only remark ever made by Dr. Buchman which attracted us was his retort to a gibe that he and his followers confined their activities to the well-to-do: "Well, God is a millionaire, isn't he?"

There is no dubiety as to the origin of this arrogance—it is in the doctrines behind the French Revolution, and in particular the conception of "equality," which has the curious effect of nourishing the most profound hatred of quality as well as a claim to be a judge of it. The French Revolution was a bourgeois upheaval, and its psychology was that of the Fabian Society. In consequence, while it would be infantile to lay the blame for the present chaos to the debit of any one specific class, a disproportionate number of its fallacies have been propagated by such persons as Mr. H. G. Wells.

There is, of course, a very real sense in which "to whom much is given, much will be required," and it is a matter which may well give food for thought to a number of successful industrialists, *not because they have become rich, but because they know, or ought to know, why nearly everyone could become rich in the economic sense.* The distinction is vital. Nearly every step in the progress of the world has come from the "privileged" classes and the equalitarian doctrine is expressly and consciously designed to frustrate disinterested effort—the only effort which can save mankind. (June 1, 1945.)

Not many matters are a ground for certainty nowadays, but on two of them it is possible to be fairly dogmatic. There will be no sensible improvement in world society until there is a radical decentralisation of money power; and there will be no decentralisation of money power by any centralised Government, no matter what it may call itself.

So far as Great Britain is concerned, every so-called progressive movement has become the focus of the money power, for reasons which are quite simple. Every progressive movement is (assuming sincerity of intention) a

distributive movement; and every distributive movement which does not distribute credit is inevitably a movement for organised robbery, which the money-power is delighted to support. The distribution of credit is the distribution of the substance (understanding) of things hoped for, the *evidence* of things *unseen*: things seen belong to somebody, and their arbitrary distribution by *force majeure* is robbery, no matter how it is disguised.

An understanding of this situation is the key to the policy of scarcity—which is the Ark of the Covenant of High Finance-World Dominion. Given the illusion of a fixed and insufficient body of wealth, a popular movement for the destruction of "vested interests" (stability of tenure) can always be worked up. And stability of tenure is the one thing which the money power will not tolerate except for itself.

Nothing is more remarkable than the contrast between the sentiments expressed by Gladstone in regard to the claims of "the City" to dominate finance, and the Liberal Party, so long led by Gladstone, the chosen instrument of international Jewry. And the Lloyd George who courageously opposed the South African War as a gold racket, was the chosen instrument of the Isaacs, the Samuels, and the Mondes, in their concerted attack on "the landed, vested interest"—an attack which coincided with and diverted attention from the degradation of "British" commercial morality to a standard, or the want of it, lower than that of the South Sea Bubble. (January 13, 1945.)

There seems to be little doubt that encyclopædism—the splitting of knowledge into "subjects"—has a curious, mesmeric, or magical consequence; the inhibition or destruction of the capacity to relate or compare experiences. The propaganda for "full employment" is so completely in the teeth of the whole theory of modern industry and the experience of the past seven-five years that it would be supposed that it would be met with a howl of derision.

But it is not; and an article by a well known woman "public relations" speaker, published in the *Sunday Times* of December 31 observes that "After the war many women who have not done so before will have to work for their living." That is to say, not only are we going to find work for the previously unemployed: but we are going to multiply the number of persons who require employment because they must "work for a living."

Anyone retaining a modicum of native intelligence would ponder over the present situation of the world and conclude that since it had developed contemporaneously with an immensely increased capacity for production, it would only be common prudence to make sure that still further insistence on production would not exacerbate it. But the inescapable fact is that success in any line of endeavour in the modern world requires the cultivation of the habit of speaking to a brief. Just as a barrister sells his forensic talent for the purpose of winning the case entrusted to him, so the modern professional man or woman is compelled to disregard the objective and concentrate on the means. Not very much of that discipline is necessary to hide the objective from view. (January 13, 1945.)