

THE SOCIAL CREDITER

FOR POLITICAL AND ECONOMIC REALISM

Volume 43 Number 9

SATURDAY, AUGUST 3, 1963

6d Fortnightly.

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 adaptation 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,

* *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.

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 30/-; Six months 15/-; Three months 7s. 6d.

Offices—Business: 9 AVENUE ROAD, STRATFORD-ON-AVON. Telephone: Stratford-on-Avon 3976.

Editorial: PENRHYN LODGE, GLOUCESTER GATE, LONDON N.W.1. Telephone: EUSTon 3893.

IN AUSTRALIA—

Business—Box 2318V, G.P.O., Melbourne.

Editorial—Box 3266, G.P.O., Sydney, Australia (Editorial Head Office).

THE SOCIAL CREDIT SECRETARIAT

Personnel—Advisory Chairman: Dr. Tudor Jones, Chairman: Dr. B. W. Monahan, 36 Melbourne Avenue, Deakin, Canberra, Australia. Deputy Chairman: British Isles: Dr. Basil L. Steele, Penrhyn Lodge, Gloucester Gate, London N.W.1. (Telephone: EUSTon 3893). Liaison Officer for Canada: Monsieur Louis Even, Maison Saint-Michel, Rougemont, P.Q. Secretary: H. A. Scoular, Box 3266, G.P.O. Sydney, N.S.W.

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 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.

Fluoridation

As an example of perspective we reprint the following letter from the *Sydney Morning Herald*, June 6, 1963:—

Sir,—Mr. Sheahan's much-vaunted contempt for others is psychologically interesting, but not calculated to promote confidence in his capacities for forming sound judgments or for acquiring sound knowledge. So it is not surprising to find that he imagines that the fluoridation problem is a health problem.

Medical science should certainly pronounce on whether fluoridation is beneficial or harmful to the health, and most people would pay respect to its findings if they knew them to be unequivocal and definite. Mr. Sheahan's role as Minister for Health is not to make pontifical statements about health as though he were a scientific expert, but to promote research and free inquiry into all aspects of the bearing of the health sciences on fluoridation.

But Mr. Sheahan seems to overlook, as many others do, that the present issue is not one relating to health sciences at all, but to political science. This is a true science, and at its root is individual liberty. People should be free to neglect their health, or even to injure their health, if they so insist. Possibly Mr. Sheahan does not propose to take measures to suppress smoking, drinking alcohol, or over-eating.

The existence of a totalitarian Government which insists on the forcible stamping out of evil would be a far worse disaster than even serious tooth decay. There are ways of voluntarily acquiring the benefits of fluoridation, in a free community, but the means to restore human rights when they are violated are very costly and difficult.

W. A. DOWE,

Director, Australian School of Social Science.

Sydney.

This in no way alters what we said seven years ago (*T.S.C.*, Sept. 29, 1956):—

"The more the nonsense of the fluoridation and anti-

⁵ Full references, and important extracts, are given by N. Webster in *Secret Societies and Subversive Movements*, p. 258 et seq.

² Obtainable from K.R.P. Publications Ltd., 9 Avenue Road, Stratford on Avon. Price 2/6 plus 6d. postage.

³ See, in particular, *Coningsby*; also speeches in House of Commons.

⁴ See *An Appraisal*, p. 70 et seq.

fluoridation campaign drags on, the more certain it appears that fluoridation is a brilliant counter-tactic to Douglas's brilliant tactic of the local objective campaign. The silly argument has absorbed for years the energies of tens of thousands; the columns of probably every newspaper throughout the world are open to the controversialists, whereas, as Social Crediters well know, the boycott on genuine Social Credit, and even on realistic discussions of political economy is as firm as when it was first imposed in the early twenties.

"Mass-medication is a trifle compared with mass-robbery *via* taxation and inflation; it is a trifle, indeed, compared with mass-conditioning *via* the A.B.C., the B.B.C., *etc.*, the I.T.V., and the Press and Broadcasting and films generally."

"Don't!"*

Many of the arguments put forward (a) to rebut or confuse the main theses of Social Credit, or (b) to inhibit or to embarrass action taken to advance Social Credit are distributed indiscriminately to ourselves and to our supporters.

Some, too foolish to commend themselves to anyone with even a slight acquaintance with our subject, are disseminated chiefly among the general public, but reach the knowledge of Social Crediters, and waste their time by annoying them. Some are addressed particularly to our supporters, with due regard to the degree of loyalty and conviction with which they support us. Others, again, are addressed particularly to us in the Secretariat. Probably few arguments were addressed directly to Douglas, with the objective of inducing him to alter or to adjust his opinions, either on economics or on politics. There, the motive, as we know from published examples, was usually to elicit a reaction of which use might be made, either pro- or anti-public acceptance of his views.

This last-mentioned motive for questioning is doubtless present, *mutatis mutandis*, at all levels. But it has been long understood that, while there was little likelihood of persuading Douglas to alter his opinions fundamentally, the time might arrive when his supporters would be shorn of such defences as he himself possessed.

The propaganda against Social Credit is incessant, subtle and ably conducted.

Without speculating concerning the category into which falls the letter printed below, we publish it as an example, containing arguments which will certainly be addressed to potential supporters whoever and wherever they may be. Notes are appended. We have, we hope, removed evidence which might lead to the identification of the writer (who, incidentally, is well-known but not as a Social Crediter).

The annotations to which the bracketed numbers refer will be published in our next issue. The letter is dated October 27, 1953:—

Dear ,

It was with great interest that I read the text of an address delivered in London last month by the Chairman of the Social Credit Secretariat, and recorded in two issues of *The Social Crediter* lent to me by

My connection with the Social Credit movement goes back to the early thirties in Jersey, Channel Islands. I was intimately acquainted with Brenton, Golder and Hargrave [1] from which relationship you will gather that I was interested in

direct action. I met Douglas on two occasions, one in his chambers in Fig Tree Court and the other driving down with him and Bardsley to Southampton. Since, I examined the Social Credit Theorem after having had some training in orthodox economics and became convinced of its correctness. I have had no reason to doubt its efficacy as a corrective for the deficiencies of the financial system. It is not on the grounds for questioning its efficacy that I regard it as futile to endeavour to attempt to introduce it. Naturally, it is not in any sense of destructive criticism that I am writing, but in the spirit of offering to you the Truth that is in me, that you may have the opportunity of considering it in relationship to the Truth that is in you. Any vested interest deeply rooted in heart and mind, will of course effectively prevent access to the Truth that is within you. It is often the fact that those who have moved out of the ranks of the orthodox in any field and had to devote energy and time to defending a non-conformist position [2] become so rooted in that position that they have greater difficulty in accepting a new idea than do those who have, perhaps rather sleepily, accepted before a conformist position.

One of Arthur Brenton's favourite remarks was to the effect that we should in any discussion first establish our "frame of reference." In this case a limited one would include the financial system, its analysis, the necessary changes to make it work to provide maximum freedom. Within this frame there is no valid argument against the Social Credit case. This is too restricted a frame to be useful except academically. It is analogous to considering the heating system in a tottering house. It may be true that the heating system is defective, the inhabitants are made uncomfortable by its deficiencies. Expert attention would remedy that defect and the inhabitants might be warmer for a time. If, however, the whole structure is about to fall, repairs to the heating system constitute a labour of futility, even supposing the controllers of the building were to allow the repairers access to the system. [3]

In a sense the idea of a "frame of reference" is misleading except in considering matters which are the result of man's efforts to do things apart from the undistorted expression of the Whole. Every part of the Truth is perfectly harmonious with every other part of the Truth and so to attempt to establish any boundaries is a misleading activity. The frame of reference, then, which one might set about the financial system leads to the position that, although the Social Credit Theorem may be correct, and the proposals for remedy, theoretically efficacious the result would be merely the correction of a superficial manifestation of a deeper cause. It is as if one were to treat a pus filled tonsil by extirpation. The symptoms in the affected part might disappear, but the underlying cause would remain, and other symptoms would in due course appear. [4]

On page 3 of *The Social Crediter* of September 19 there appears the following passage: "I suggest that if we do not assume powers which we do not possess, but steadfastly use those powers which we do possess—and that by the Grace of God, and not by any power of our own, except that we have placed ourselves at its disposal—by some Rule of universal application, these suffice for what tasks can be justly expected of us to perform. If we do not borrow or steal credit, but confine ourselves to the employment of what credit is naturally given to us, or divinely given to us in the practical affairs of life, it suffices . . ." This passage provides an excellent starting point for the expression of the Truth to which I have referred. What I am about to say is not "religion" for I would

* Reprinted from our issue for Dec. 5, 1953.

define "religion" as made up of man's conceptions [5] about his relationship to God. It is, on the other hand, "spiritual"—related to the facts about man's relationship to God. What is the "Rule of universal application" to which reference is made? [6] The Rule can be stated in the following terms: Positive action and negative reaction. Consider every system within the scope of human perception; every one is based on the negative or responsive reaction of a body to the positive or controlling action of a nucleus. In the atom a body of electrons negative to a nucleus, in the solar system a body of planets controlled by the sun, provide illustrations of the Rule in action. What of man? It is because he fails to recognise and harmonise with the Rule that he finds himself in chaos. Every disorder, spiritual, mental, emotional, physical and in affairs, including the financial system, results from failure to accept this Rule. It is clear that electrons are controlled according to a precise pattern by the positive radiations from the nucleus. They have no choice but to accept it. This acceptance is the condition of harmony in the system. Supposing that an electron were to become positive to the nucleus, that system would break down. [7]

It would be reasonable to suppose that man is constituted according to the same pattern, that there is within him something that corresponds to the nucleus in the atom, and that the outer manifestation of man, spiritual expression, mind, emotions, body corresponds to the body of electrons. There is plenty of evidence for the presence within man of such a nucleus. The processes of digestion and breathing involve an interplay of factors that is far beyond the understanding and control of the human mind, except destructively. The human mind did not make man in the first place, and the processes go on even when the self-conscious mind lapses into unself-consciousness in sleep or coma.

There is present within [8] each human being this nucleus. It is the integrating force within him, when this nucleus withdraws the outer begins immediately to disintegrate. It is clear that the nucleus is of eternal identity because there is obviously no such thing as dead life, all life is everlasting, and death is only the absence of life. [9] The diversity of outer manifestations in physical form indicate diversity of form in the realm within. Noble actions have an individual stamp which indicate the individuality of the positive source of such actions.

We have had in recent years dramatic evidence of the force latent in the atom. It is at least likely that an even greater outlet of Power is latent in man. In everyone if we have eyes to see we may perceive the evidence of the presence of that positive nucleus. [10]

So far in this discussion I have limited myself to what may be described as the scientific [11] approach, considering evidence that is appreciable by the mind working on the evidence of the senses, although in the case of the atom it is perhaps rather an act of faith to use the supposed structure. However, the line of development would have been equally valid if the solar system had been used as an example. Let us consider the matter from the Spiritual standpoint.

In the teaching of Jesus Christ there are the two Great Commandments about which He said "On these two commandments hang all the law and the prophets." "Thou shalt love the Lord, thy God, with all thy heart, and with all thy soul, and with all thy mind. This is the first and greatest commandment." Matthew 22: 37, 38. Love is the one power of the Universe: it is the irradiation of the positive phase of

love which keeps electrons and planets in their orbits. It is the negative or responsive phase of love which maintains the relationship from the standpoint of the electrons and the planets. The first great commandment is the expression in different terms of the one Law, the Rule of universal application, positive action and negative reaction. The key to the failure of most to live according to the Commandments is due to the lack of understanding that these are two phases of love. The phase of love that the human or outer usually expresses is the negative or responsive phase, and *all* of this phase should properly be centred in the Lord God within ("The kingdom of Heaven is within you. Be ye therefore perfect even as your Father which is in Heaven is perfect"). If all human or responsive love is centred in God within, there is not a shred of this phase left over for oneself (the outer) nor is there any left over for the neighbour. The Love with which one is loved and also the neighbour is the positive radiant controlling Love of the Father within. "The words that I speak, I speak not of myself but the Father who dwelleth within me He doeth the works."

The command to love one's enemies cannot be obeyed according to the usual interpretation of the First Commandment. Anyone who tries to love an enemy in human strength with the responsive phase of love opens himself to the control of the enemy and this is the way of destruction. It is the most devastating thing for the enemy to be loved with the Radiant phase of Love if he continues to be inimical, for it is impossible to fight against God and live, and the radiant phase of Love is the expression of God through man.

This is not merely another interpretation of the teaching of Jesus Christ, it is the way of life. I have let it work in my life for fifteen years and seen its effects in the lives of scores of others. For six and a half years we (my wife, daughter and myself) were members of a community established in the foothills of . . . in which we proved that the harmonisation with the principles outlined allowed changes to be wrought in human nature through which a state of absolute harmony was established. Since God made man in the first place it is only through His Power that man can be repaired. Since all distortions in any phase of human expression result from lack of attunement with God, the cure is to return to attunement with Him. This is the first thing to do and all else follows. Any attempt to fight the controllers of money is bound to fail. What is true will stand and what is based on a lie will fall. Any attempt to overthrow what is based on a lie is a "stealing of credit" to be misused in futile pursuits. If we seek first the Kingdom of God and His righteousness all these things shall be added unto us.

The attempt, however well meaning, of the repair men to get into the crumbling house to repair the heating system is bound to fail, and even if entry was made the repairing would be futile, for the house is falling. Let it fall. There are two ways of knowing the Truth that makes free. One is to find confirmation that something is the Truth, and that confirmation will come from the Father within, if the mind is not too cluttered with investments. The other is to wait and see, for the truth will stand, and the untrue will fall; but the pressure that will come to bear to cause the fall of the untrue must of course carry with it all that is not already a part of the Truth. . . ."