

THE SOCIAL CREDITOR

FOR POLITICAL AND ECONOMIC REALISM

Vol. 36. No. 22.

SATURDAY, FEBRUARY 22, 1958.

Postage, 2d.

6d. Fortnightly.

The Development of World Dominion

During the period of the Socialist Administration in Great Britain, following the end of World War II, *The Social Creditor* 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.

In 1786, three years before the French Revolution, the Grand Orient merged with the Grand Chapter of the Knights Templars. The spirit of the Grand Chapter was revolutionary, "but the Revolution was to be accomplished above all for the benefit of the upper class (*la haute bourgeoisie*) with the people as its instrument."

—*Martines de Pasqually*: Papus, p. 144.

Well, that seems to explain Sir Ernest Cassel and his gift of £472,000 to the London School of Economics. "*La haute bourgeoisie*" would be better translated by "big business." (January 12, 1946.)

Redhead Yorke was imprisoned in Dorchester Castle from 1795 to 1799 for being "a man who had been concerned in three revolutions already . . . and who will continue to cause revolutions all over the world." When he was released, he hastened to France to continue his revolutionary activities. He was evidently an honest man, and he wrote a book, *France in 1802*, in which he admitted to complete disillusionment. As an instance of the difference between the vicious romanticism of Carlyle and the facts as seen, not by an unbiased, but by a very reluctantly converted, witness, the following passage (p. 28) is instructive.

"The Revolution, which was brought about ostensibly for the benefit of the lower classes of society, has sunk them to a degree of degradation and misfortune to which they were never reduced under the ancient monarchy.

They have been disinherited, stripped, and deprived of every resource for existence, except defeats of arms and the fleeting spoil of vanquished nations."

(January 12, 1946.)

"Of 23 Divisional Generals" [of the Spanish Republican Army. *Editor, T.S.C.*] "twenty-one were members of the Grand Orient. They had taken the oath, 'I swear obedience without limitation to the head of the Council of Thirty-Three. . . . I swear not to recognise any mortal above him.' Both in 1929, for the abolition of the Dictatorship of Primo de Rivera, and in 1931, for the abolition of the Monarchy, the Masons gave their orders and the Generals obeyed . . . seven of the eleven signatories of the 'Provisional Republican Government' were members of the Spanish Lodges." : : —*Spanish Arena*, p. 100.

Where do you think the present agitation against Spain is coming from? (January 5, 1946.)

If a man, presently at Crewe, says he wishes to go to London, and then insists on entering a carriage labelled Wigan, you will probably be tempted to call him, "incompetent," "inefficient" or some of the other words frequently heard in connection with the Socialist incumbents of our present governing system, (together with adjectives less suitable for reproduction). But you may be quite wrong. The man may really have intended to go to Wigan, and have told you he was going in the other direction, to avoid argument, as to the relative attractions of Wigan and London. When, therefore, you notice that affairs in this country are getting steadily worse; that badly as they were managed after 1918, they are incomparably worse managed *from your point of view* now, it is not wise to assume that your affairs have been handed over to a collection of nit-wits, because if you have any experience of affairs you will have learnt that Cabinet posts at £5,000 *per annum* do not come into the grasp of nit-wits. The qualities which got them there may not be—almost certainly are not—the qualities you consider suitable to their position. But you must remember that you did not put them where they are, although perhaps you think you did.

There is a good deal of evidence to suggest that this Administration, to use the more descriptive "American" word, is highly competent. If it be remembered that Mr.

(Continued on page 3.)

THE SOCIAL CREDITER FOR POLITICAL AND ECONOMIC REALISM

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

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

“Baraka”

The *Hibbert Journal* for July, 1957, contains an article by John Hamilton entitled “Baraka.” It is an account of a district in Africa of which he was in charge. He relates how: “The natives had evolved a simple system of irrigation and on the land enriched by the silt were accustomed to raise grain and cotton of the finest quality. So fine indeed were these crops that the government decided to develop this area for the general financial benefit of the territory and granted concession to a company to organise and manage the scheme.

An old sheikh with whom the author discussed the project “took a gloomy view of the whole affair,” and when asked for the reason for his attitude said: “From time immemorial these lands have been our granary and grazing ground, and now a company will come and disorganise our life. Although we shall doubtless become richer, how will that benefit us? Our life will be upset, our young men will become demoralised and the *Baraka* will go from us.” “The words of my old friend,” Mr. Hamilton says, “were prophetic, for after four years of friction and difficulties the company was offered and accepted an alternative concession elsewhere.”

To the question—“What is Baraka” the author tells us that: “According to Steingass’ Arabic dictionary, it means blessing, happiness, abundance, fertility.” And the author continues—“To these definitions I would add virtue and grace.” Also he tells us that: Douffé, in his book *Magie et Religion dans l’Afrique du Nord*, describes it as “le contraire du mauvais oeil,” whilst Westermarck devotes three chapters in *Ritual and Belief in Morocco* to the subject, which he defines as “blessed, magic virtue.” And the author states his conviction that “this intangible quality has a relevance to the problems of the modern world.”

The remainder of the article is concerned with the ways that tend today to destroy *Baraka*, and sees in them “evidence of something wrong in our social values. Like the Gadarene swine, we are in danger of rushing down a steep place to disaster.” But no attempt is made to enquire into the cause of this decline of *baraka*—to answer the question as to why a society that could enjoy peace and plenty takes it into its head to destroy social values, and, like the Gadarene swine rush towards disaster.

Reasons given by the moralists do not satisfy. The profit motive, selfishness, materialism and the like provide no answer to this problem. The sociologist must seek further and deeper. As it is, their denunciations, clichés and moralistic exhortations merely provide a useful and convenient smoke screen behind which those really concerned

in the work of destruction can continue secretly to advance towards their bitter end.

It may be argued that profit was the aim of the company granted the concession, and in the sense of financial gain that is true; but the destruction of the social value of the tribe, of its *baraka* was a hindrance to its activities and it had to depart. Nevertheless, profit, in the sense of material gain, of increase of wealth due to good husbandry, was the aim of the tribe, and its *baraka* was the cause and the result of its successful accomplishment.

Furthermore how, one must ask the moralist, did the great depression between the two world wars, and the consequent destruction of material wealth benefit the materialists? How do the hazards of booms and slumps, the spiral of inflation, and pretended attempts to defeat it by credit squeezes and the raising of the bank rate help the profit-seeking industrialists? Are all these people out to defeat their own ends?

The answer is revealed in the case cited above. The sheikh deplored the advent of the company granted the concession. He foresaw the consequences, but he was not free to resist the invasion of his territory, and the activities of the alien power that sought to exploit it. “Our life will be upset,” he clearly saw; but he could do nothing, he was not master in his own house. Even the concession was *granted*; but not by the tribe from whom alone permission should have been sought.

What power was it that could step in and interfere to its detriment with its freedom and sovereignty and destroy its social value? Is it not the same power that is behind the plan to destroy national sovereignties: behind the power to nationalise industries: behind the subtle suggestions to develop the ‘backward’ countries, turning them into paid servants of the financial power and thus facilitate the achievement of World Dictatorship, euphemistically called One World? Is it not also behind propaganda and brain-washing so that, at the last, the final take-over may be made easy?

What is this power that is contriving to destroy man’s freedom? That is the question to which the moralists should seek an answer; for all theories about the destiny of man, whether moral, philosophic or scientific, are irrelevant and beside the point while it continues to pursue its way unhindered. Man must be free to fulfil his destiny.

In his endeavour to define *baraka* the author concludes with the words: “Perhaps the answer is that baraka, like God, is love. It may be as simple as all that.” If we agree with his conclusion, then, in that power that seeks to undermine and destroy *baraka*, do we not see the operations and designs, the many inventions of that ‘Old Serpent’ which, from the beginning, sought to destroy man’s integrity and deprive him of freedom, thereby gaining dominion over him in order, at the last, to establish his own kingdom of hell, hate, fear and unrighteousness? May it not be “as simple as all that?” B.C.B.

“Whose Service is Perfect Freedom”

by

C. H. Douglas.

5/- Post Free.

K.R.P. Publications, Ltd., 11, Garfield Street, Belfast.

John M. Macara

After a long illness Mr. John Macara of Sydney passed away on January 20, 1958.

Mr. Macara was a pioneer in the Social Credit cause in Australia. He will be remembered for his great work in the early days of the Douglas Social Credit Association of New South Wales, of which he was President for a long period, and The Electoral Campaign (N.S.W.), of which he was Chairman.

The Four Reformers

Four reformers met under a bramble bush. They were all agreed the world must be changed. "We must abolish property," said one.

"We must abolish marriage," said the second.

"We must abolish God," said the third.

"I wish we could abolish work," said the fourth.

"Do not let us get beyond practical politics," said the first. "The first thing is to reduce men to a common level."

"The first thing," said the second, "is to give freedom to the sexes."

"The first thing," said the third, "is to find out how to do it."

"The first step," said the first, "is to abolish the Bible."

"The first thing," said the second, "is to abolish the laws."

"The first thing," said the third, "is to abolish mankind."

—R. L. STEVENSON.

THE DEVELOPMENT OF WORLD DOMINION—

(Continued from page 1.)

Montagu Norman is reported as saying, "I do not think it is desirable for a country to be prosperous," and observe the manoeuvres of his fellow-Etonian, Dr. Hugh Dalton, and the nephew of Mr. and Mrs. Sydney Webb, Sir Stafford Cripps, "The Red Squire," you will perhaps consider contemplatively the odd coincidence that in a "Labour" Administration, the two key positions in the economic life of the British people, the Exchequer and the Board of Trade, are filled by products of the most expensive and "old-school-tie-ish" Public Schools in England, not to mention close affiliation with the London School of Economics. Taking their key words, "Full Employment," "Austerity" and "Unlimited Exports" as signposts, it is really not difficult to see why the train is going to Wigan when you suppose that everyone wants it to go to London. Briefly, and not comprehensively, Dr. Dalton and Sir Stafford Cripps want precisely the same result as Mr. Montagu Norman, and are prepared to go to almost any length to achieve that end. The general population is to be finally and permanently proletarianised: and Eton and Winchester, like the new Eton which Stalin proposes to set up, will provide hereditary Kommissars. And if you think that progress towards "Wigan" instead of London will ensure the removal of Dr. Dalton and Sir Stafford, think again. Only failure to "progress" fast enough, will do that. And Wigan? Wigan is merely Big Business as Government.

It is important to understand what is involved in this matter. Whatever (if ever) may once have been true of the great Protestant Public Schools, the vague idea that they are the preserve of the aristocracy has no resemblance to truth at the present time. Leaving altogether aside the question of what kind of aristocracy has any effective existence in England there is no doubt that it is *la haute bourgeoisie* who dominate the Public Schools, and it is to *la haute bourgeoisie* Dalton and Cripps belong, and in whose interests (they think) Sir Ernest Cassel gave half a million pounds to the London School of Economics, ostensibly founded by Sidney Webb, Sir Stafford's uncle. *La haute bourgeoisie* for whom the Grand Chapter of the Knights Templars was to make a revolution by using the Common People, and whom Marx understood perfectly when he said they were so valuable in substituting a soulless cash nexus for the humanistic relationships of "feudalism"—"charity" for *caritas*. To him, they had a use for his ultimate purpose, like every one else; but he made no bones about their early fate, when he had finished with them.

Unfortunately, a salient characteristic of *la haute bourgeoisie* is that it is practically unteachable; if this were not so, we would suggest to Dr. Dalton and Sir Stafford that they contemplate the intentions of Marx on their behalf. (February 9, 1946.)

When, as in a recent speech by Sir Stafford Cripps, it is suggested that the extended use of "Planning," with a capital, and central control, is the basis of the victory (if there is a victory) over Germany, and that it is thereby demonstrated that "Planning" and Central Control is the magic formula for the Brave New World, there are, we think, two legitimate, alternative conclusions to be drawn, and two only. The first is that the speaker is merely talking to a brief, a habit easy to lawyers, and the second and probably the true one, is that he has no conception of the real meaning of what he is saying.

During the first (1914-1918) phase of this war Russia, a country of 190,000,000 inhabitants was paralysed. Immense quantities of material, as in this latter phase, were supplied to Russia by Great Britain, but were not used. Thanks to the fact that it was under British command, the British Expeditionary Force was not sacrificed, and the Channel ports were held. The populations of France and Great Britain about equalled the Central Powers. It is true, of course, that America inevitably won the war, but she did little of the fighting. Germany was beaten in four years, and would have stayed beaten, if centralised international finance had not been determined that the war should be resumed to impose Central Control on the world.

In the second (1939-194—) phase of the war, Germany is not finally beaten in the sixth year, with a Russia against her which has had the primary object under totalitarian central control, of preparing for war for over twenty years, a Britain which narrowly escaped the fate of a Central Command under Gamelin, and a United States kicked into the war in 1941. Disregarding "resistance" movements, the major populations arrayed against Germany's eighty millions amount to more than three hundred and eight

millions directly, and nearly twice as many indirectly. If Sir Stafford Cripps, or anyone else, claims that even in war, the virtues of unlimited centralisation have been demonstrated, they will claim anything, probable or improbable.

But in fact, it is exactly in those matters in which "planning" is impossible that the key to victory will be found, if anywhere. There has been a spate of verbiage as to the various "turning-points" of the war, but no historian will be found to deny that without the victory of the little band of Fighter pilots over the *Luftwaffe* in 1940, nothing subsequently done by Russia or the United States would have stopped Hitler. Does Sir Stafford Cripps think that victory was due to P.E.P.? Did the Socialists design the Spitfire or the Hurricane?

No one ever knows exactly how much waste and confusion a Socialist state involves because, as in the case of Russia, everything is done to make comparison impossible and to distort such facts as are available. But the waste of man-power directly due to Government control in this country at the present time probably exceeds that of any previous period in our history. But it is paid waste, so no one complains seriously. (April 7, 1945.)

It is as sensible—neither more nor less—to speak of "the necessity of restoring the control of currency and credit to the Government" as to speak of "the necessity of restoring the control of wheat-growing to the Government." Mr. Mackenzie-King, in his much quoted and significant speech at Saskatoon in 1935, knew exactly what he was saying when he used those words, because he had been told. The control of currency and credit has been in the hands of the "Canadian Government" as well as of the "British Government" for nearly ten years. And where we are is where it has got us, and Bretton Woods is where we are going.

What matters both about money and wheat is: who gets it, and on what terms. It should hardly be necessary to refer again to the fallacy that individuals of the general public have any control over the Government, either directly, or through "their" Members of Parliament, and Bretton Woods is explicitly above Governments.

The root of this matter is that a collectivity has no moral standards of its own, and invariably reflects the lowest morals of its constituent units. If any additional proof of this statement beyond the investigations of Gustave le Bon were required, it is supplied at the moment by the "Government" Surplus racket. As we have several times stated, without apparently causing a ripple of public interest, everything made by "Government" instruction, and therefore paid for either by taxation or inflation, belongs to those who bear the taxation or inflation, without further payment. But it is being given away or sabotaged without even the pretence of permission. Not only does the taxpayer not get his property, which certainly amounts to hundreds, and may easily amount to thousands of millions in value, but eight months after the end of the German War, not a visible dribble of the piles of available stores is reaching the consuming public, even by purchase. We don't wonder that Mr. Ellis Smith resigned. Any man who doesn't resign from this racket is an accessory

before and after the fact of the most gigantic robbery in all history.

And this includes the High Priest of Austerity.

The essential point to notice in all this, is the dissolution of all the framework of civilisation. Under the tawdry and discredited argument of "efficiency," property is stolen and sequestered, liberty is curtailed and abolished, and alien vulgarity is forced on an ancient and honourable culture. It is so well understood that any association which is to function over a period of time must have a "constitution" that no limited company can trade without a memorandum and articles of association, which define its powers, and are not changeable except by a difficult procedure. But the Company of Gentlemen Adventurers in Great Britain now has no rules, written or traditional.

Any gang which gets a majority, by a fallacious ballot and a manipulated agenda, can upset all the rules, sell or give away all the assets, and liquidate the Company, all in the sacred name of d'markrazi. It is not a question of "Party," but it is beyond question that the less scrupulous the gang, the less it is handicapped either in the achievement of power, or the use of it. (January 26, 1946.)

Not the least of the weapons in the armoury of the Dark Forces is the carefully-managed ridicule which accompanies any general suggestion of their existence. So far as we are aware, there is no very effective answer to this tactic other than the lapse of time, because it is a subtle appeal to what the Americans call "a regular fellow"—a type beautifully portrayed in *Babbitt*. Nevertheless, the trail of the serpent is becoming more visible daily, and one of its curious manifestations is the fervour of the Left for Internationalism for the British Isles and Nationalism for everyone else, and particularly for the British Dominions.

In the Canadian House of Commons a discussion—not the first—on the question of a national flag for Canada has been in progress. Who so ultra-patriotic as Mr. Rose, the Jewish Communist who sits for the Cartier Division of Montreal as "Labour-Progressive"? And Mr. Coldwell, the Leader of the Socialists (C.C.F.), born in Devon and an alumnus of the London School of Economics? What is "Britain" to him? "I hope a choice will not be made of a flag which will prove to be not sufficiently distinctive," (*i.e.*, distinctly non-British).

Through all the arguments of both Mr. Rose and Mr. Coldwell, together with others more obviously anti-English, ran a dislike of a flag composed of three crosses—those of St. George, St. Andrew and St. Patrick.