

THE SOCIAL CREDITER

FOR POLITICAL AND ECONOMIC REALISM

Vol. 47 No. 7

SATURDAY, JULY 1, 1967

1s. 3d. Fortnightly

Social Credit and Suez

We re-publish, unaltered, an article published in these pages in 1957. The original Suez crisis high-lighted the demise of the British Empire—the end of any independent British initiative. The present Middle East ‘crisis’ bears every mark of prefabrication, and exposes once again the operation of long-term policy. Neither the Arab States nor Israel are military powers—in terms of modern warfare they have no real munitions industries, and thus could *sustain* war only to the extent that they were supplied with munitions. But they were armed, by the US-USSR axis, to the extent that a conflict could be staged, with the consequence that Europe’s oil supplies would be cut off. This achieved, the USSR has moved from a position of support for the Arabs to support of a cease-fire. Need more be said?

I

There has probably never been a world crisis about which opinion, both professional and public, has been so confused. Such a state of affairs strongly suggests either that there are insufficient facts on which to base a judgment; or that the facts, or some of them, are not what they appear to be. But what is unquestionably true is that in all the ‘explanations’ of the crisis which we have seen put forward in every type of journal, from the more responsible to the merely cranky, some of the available facts have been left out of account. And it is thanks to the late C. H. Douglas’s mastery of those facts, and his patient elucidation of them, that Social Credit can contribute to a fuller understanding of the crisis.

Douglas pointed out that the series of crises which have afflicted mankind particularly in this century, despite the progress in the industrial arts, with its promise of life more abundant for all, is due either to the hopeless perversity of mankind, or is the outcome of a long-term policy. If the former, annihilation not only awaits us, but is to be preferred. If the latter, and if we can identify the policy, and those responsible for it, *and can deal with them*, we have a chance of survival and of a life more abundant.

What do we mean by a long-term policy? We mean action taken over a long period of years to bring about a certain state of affairs, postulated in advance. For example, some years after the rise of Hitler, it became evident that he was following a policy of making Germany supreme in Europe, and, as it later transpired, supreme in the world. Once this policy was appreciated and understood, it became evident that Hitler’s policy must be actively opposed, or we would become slaves to Germany. But what was not so evident in, say, 1939, but has become clear since, is that Hitler took over an already existing policy. The world supremacy of Germany was the continuous policy of the Great German General Staff. It received a set-back in 1918, through the defeat of German arms; but the Great German General Staff retained its effective identity, in mufti, and carried on its long-term policy “by other means,” as Clausewitz put it. Once the long-term continuity of this policy is grasped, the

appearance of Hitler on the scene takes on a different significance. The 1939 war was not *primarily* due to Hitler, whatever he contributed to its timing and direction. There would have been someone; and, in retrospect, it appears probable that Hitler lost the military war which the Great German General Staff had decided on, and would probably have won had they not been interfered with by Hitler.

There are quite clear geographical reasons which explain why Germany, in the course of history, developed an aggressive policy. They are well expounded in Professor Derwent Whittlesey’s *German Strategy of World Conquest*. This policy originally was a natural reaction to environment. But at least by the time of Frederick the Great it had become a conscious and deliberate policy of conquest, and the German State was just as deliberately organised with that end in view. Every aspect of life was subordinated to the policy of German conquest; and the military phases of that policy were, in Clausewitz’s words, only “the continuation of policy by other means.”

That, then, is a long-term policy: a project pursued over the course of many generations.

II

Revolutionary Communism is another long-term policy. Marxian Communism as a definite movement dates from the Communist Manifesto; but its roots go back much further. While the German policy is primarily one of conquest, the Marxian policy is primarily one of subversion, based on the systematic exploitation of grievances, and the undermining of traditional government. By far the best account of Communist objectives and techniques is contained in Stalin’s *Problems of Leninism*; and what is particularly germane to the present crisis is the technique of encouraging nationalist movements and promoting “anti-colonialism,” with the objective of weakening the Great Powers, and of producing unsettled conditions. Like Frederick the Great, Stalin regarded diplomacy as nothing but a method of tricking his adversary; sincere diplomacy, he wrote, is no more possible than dry water, or wooden iron. This thoroughly perverted point of view permeates the whole of Communist theory. Communism has a single, clear, objective: a world Socialist State, policed by the Red Army and the secret police. Although this objective is quite clearly displayed in, for example, *Problems of Leninism*, Russian “diplomacy” has been remarkably successful in concealing it, just as Hitler’s

(continued on page 2)

None Dare Call It Treason

by John Stormer

The almost incredible but carefully documented story of the progress of Conspiracy in America.

6/2 posted

K.R.P. Publications Ltd., 245 Cann Hall Road, London, E.11.

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 40/-; Six months 20/-; Three months 10/-.

Offices: Business: 245 Cann Hall Road, Leytonstone, London E.11.
Telephone: 01-534 7395

Editorial: Penrhyn Lodge, Gloucester Gate, London NW1
Telephone: EUSton 3893.

IN AUSTRALIA—

Business: Box 2318V, G.P.O., Melbourne, Victoria.
Editorial: Box 3266, G.P.O., Sydney, N.S.W. (Editorial Head Office).

THE SOCIAL CREDIT SECRETARIAT

Personnel—Chairman: Dr. B. W. Monahan, 4 Torres Street, Red Hill, 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.

Social Credit and Suez, and in 1967

To give early re-publication of *Social Credit and Suez* the final three chapters of *Social Credit in 1967* have been held over. They will appear in our next issue.

The critical importance of this issue makes it imperative to reach a much wider circle of responsible and influential persons, and additional copies will be supplied free on request. Enquiries should be addressed to K.R.P. Publications Ltd., 245 Cann Hall Road, London E.11.

Copies of this current issue of *T.S.C.* are being sent to all Federal Members of Parliament in Australia.

Nearing the Abyss

From the article "Subsidies" (*T.S.C.* May 20, 1967) it is plain that we are shortly to be subjected to the Plan which appears to have been first tried out by Jacob on his brother Esau (Gen. 25, vs. 29-34). Later, Jacob's son, Joseph, used the Plan most effectively on the Egyptian nation, reducing them to slavery inside two years (Gen. 47, vs. 13-26).

In essence, the Plan is devastatingly simple. The operator gains control of the larder, and proceeds—by cunning, including "psychological preparation", or by force—to dictate the terms under which the masses may obtain their daily bread.

Because all living creatures are primarily consumers, their very lives depend upon ready access to food at all times.

Dictators throughout the ages have relied on this basic fact to bring nations to their knees. Cunningly they have instilled into the minds of the masses that they are primarily workers who must justify their right to life by working for their daily bread. They do not notice that today's bread is not produced by to-day's work. We consume in the present the products of the past, that we may maintain strength to produce in the future.

Generation after generation has followed this "worker" lie until it has become habitual thought, accepted without demur as the truth. It would seem to be an impossibility to break this traditional habit of thought, yet, unless this lying belief is broken, world slavery, under our modern Josephs, is certain.

—H.E.B.

Social Credit and Suez (continued from page 1)
diplomacy concealed the reality of objectives laid down in *Mein Kampf*. The result, at present, is that Russia appears on the world stage as an aggressive Power, holding over mankind the threat of a third, "atomic", war.

This threat of war is an essential ingredient of Communist strategy. It places the burden of armament on Russia's 'adversaries' and so, in part, depresses the standard of living, makes traditional government more onerous, and increases the possibility of panics and disorders.

Yet, as events have repeatedly demonstrated, aggressive war is not Russia's intention. The function of the Red Army is to 'support' insurrections and revolutionary governments, thus acting under a facade of legality, whatever the concrete results are. It is a deadly and successful technique.

To the extent that a threat of war is taken as real, a country threatened must prepare for a successful war, or accept defeat. Under modern conditions, successful war means the subordination of society to that end—that is to say, totalitarian organisations. While the threat persists, so must the organisation, irrespective of changes of government; a permanent bureaucracy, charged with building and maintaining organisation, must be installed. This again furthers the Communist objective, because in the event of revolution, or if by 'democratic' processes a Communist party, or party favourable to Russia, comes to power, the central controls to make power over the population permanent are there ready to be seized.

III

While, of course, many members of the Great German General Staff are simply highly trained and competent military officers, while others are part of the State bureaucracy, the planning section consists of what amount for practical purposes to monomaniacs. Their task is to prepare plans for world conquest, in all eventualities and anywhere in the world.

This preoccupation with the theoretical problems of world conquest gradually led to theories of the relations of peoples, resources, and geographical areas. In 1916 a Swedish political scientist, Rudolph Kjellen, coined the word "geopolitics", and systematised the sort of conceptions the Germans were dealing with (see *German Strategy of World Conquest*). These systematic ideas were taken up by the German Karl Haushofer, who developed the subject and propagandised it. Largely through this, the German nation became consciously imbued with the ideas which the Great German General Staff had been secretly promoting for generations.

But long before this popularisation and systemation of the ideas of geo-politics, the practical importance of the Eurasian land mass had become evident to the Great German General Staff, and some, including Nietzsche, foresaw the union of Russia and Germany—either by the conquest of one by the other, or through common interest.

The British geographer, Halford J. Mackinder, wrote in 1919: "West Europe, both insular and peninsular, must necessarily be opposed to whatever Power attempts to organise the resources of East Europe and the Heartland. . . . German *Kultur*, and all that it means in the way of organisation, would have made that German domination a chastisement of scorpions as compared with the whip of Russia." (Quoted by Whittlesey, op. cit. p. 67)

But the fact of the matter is that there is now a fusion of Eastern Europe, including 'Eastern' Germany, and 'Russia,' which controls the Heartland. And as 'Western' Germany is not much use at the moment to the Great German General Staff, it is all too probable that it has transferred its ambitions and abilities to Moscow. Hitler attacked Russia; but Stalin said "Hitlers come and Hitlers go; but the German people remain." If anyone thinks that Stalin's remark was meaningless, or mere propaganda, or that the Great German General Staff, with a continuity of hundreds of years, disappeared in the Nuremberg trials, he is in for an unpleasant surprise.

IV

The technique of attaining world dominion whether by conquest or by subversion may be said to depend on two main principles—force, and make-believe. Force requires totalitarian organisation, and control of massive resources. Make-believe requires control of news and propaganda.

The information very much condensed in the preceding passages of this essay is widely and easily available. The real difficulty is that it is so much diluted by make-believe and opinion as to be lost to view. It is this that gives rise to what Douglas called "the episodic view of history." Events like the nationalisation of the Suez canal just happen, British and French reaction are just 'colonialism'; and the best that can be done is an improvised solution to avert World War III.

But are the events of the Suez canal crisis just episodes? Do they bear no relation to the long-term policies, on the one hand of German plans for world dominion through conquest, and on the other, of 'Russian' plans for world dominion through subversion? To answer this question, it is necessary to try to trace the continuity of these policies since the end of World War II.

We have not the full authenticated records of history to help us at this point; but there are numerous facts which can be related to the long-term policies under review.

First, as to what happened. "On May 8th, 1945, when the war ended, Poland was in the grip of another alien dictator and the balance of power was as dangerously distorted as it had been five years earlier, for Berlin, Prague, Vienna, as well as every capital in Eastern Europe, were again in the grip of a single power." (Chester Wilmot, *The Struggle for Europe*)

Greece and Jugoslavia would have been included in this grip, but for the action of the British. And this action of the British was condemned by an obviously organised public opinion throughout the world, supported by *The Times*.

Next, under the auspices of the (then) United Nations Organisation, the United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration was set up, with the ostensible objective of providing sustenance to devastated Europe, whose condition was aggravated by the fact that the main food producing areas of Europe were under Russian occupation. But Sir Frederick Morgan exposed the fact—and lost his position as a result—that the organisation of U.N.R.R.A. was being used as a cover for the exodus of Jews from Europe and Russia to Palestine.

During the war, America instituted Lend-Lease to the opponents of Germany—a device to circumvent Congress's prohibition of the supply of arms to belligerents except on a cash and carry basis—on which basis Great Britain had rapidly dissipated her own and her nationals' dollar resources.

Quite naturally, Great Britain's enormous war effort made her dependent on Lend-Lease not only during the war, but for some time after, until industry could be re-converted to peace-time purposes. But long before such conversion could be made, Lend-Lease was suddenly, and without warning, terminated. This created a situation in which the negotiation of a dollar loan, on terms all details of which have not been revealed, was essential.

Following a campaign of terrorism, combined with virulent anti-British propaganda, in Palestine, the State of Israel was created and recognised by the U.N., following extraordinary behind-the-scenes manoeuvres.

For a period after the termination of hostilities in Europe, Russia remained our 'ally.' But then Mr. Churchill went to America, and at Fulton gave a speech which resounded throughout the world, in which he referred to the Iron Curtain across Europe, and after which Russia became world enemy No. 1. The Cold War, with all its atomic implications, began from that date.

We are back to the threat of war. As a direct consequence, we have the 'peace-loving' democracies being organised, individually and collectively, along lines appropriate to war.

Despite the threat of war with Russia, the 'peace-loving' democracies do not constitute a solid front, as has become evident particularly since the Suez crisis.

It would, I think, be generally agreed that the only country able and, at least in appearance, likely to wage a world war, is Russia. It seems equally likely that America, or America and the British Empire, could make enough of a fight of it to deter Russia, if they were clear in their objective. To put it another way, a clear treaty between the U.S.A. and the British Empire that they would maintain sufficient forces successfully to oppose Russia; that they would oppose any military action anywhere; and that they would, when desired, assist in the settlement of disputes, would almost certainly suffice to maintain peace—more especially as the fundamental desire of the peoples, as opposed to Governments, of the earth is for peace. That is to say that if the U.S.A. and the British Empire acted as police forces, they would be more effective than the U.N. has proved to be.

But if this has not been, and cannot be done, it suggests that there is an antagonism between the U.S.A. and the British Empire.

There is mounting evidence of that. It is quite evident that the U.S.A. has developed economic sanctions against the British Empire, and has used them to develop other sanctions. We know that American influence encouraged the Iran crisis; and that American influence replaced British when Iran nationalised the oil industry. The British economy, as at present constituted, is dependent on oil.

But again, this U.S.A. opposition to the British Empire, so much more evident since the Suez crisis, is not a post World War II phenomenon. It was quite evident as a post World War I policy. So once more we are confronted with the operation of a long-term policy in the present crisis.

V

The present crisis involves Israel. Has Israel a long-term policy? Was the setting up of the State of Israel fortuitous, or was it related to a larger strategy? If so, whose?

Nobody should be in any doubt, since the seizure of the Suez Canal, that the very existence of Great Britain as any-

thing but an off-shore island is now at stake. From being the centre of an Empire, containing within it the raw materials necessary for a completely independent existence, Great Britain is now dependent on 'dollars' for the means of existence; and is within an ace of losing free access to oil, the lack of which would produce an economic catastrophe beside which the great depression would look like a vacation. And world opinion is being systematically brought to the point where it would have little sympathy for the British victims.

Therefore it is vital to have a correct appreciation of the forces and policies involved in the present crisis.

Writing in 1944, C. H. Douglas said this of Israel: "Zionism is something very different to a simple scheme for the return of the Jews to Palestine. That is incidental to the moulding of events and Governments to procure a World Dominion for 'Israel'. The objective involves a perfectly clear, coherent and continuous policy on the part of the Zionists. The conditions for successive and major crises must be created and maintained in the world; the means required to deal with each crisis as it arises must be in the hands of Zionist Jews, directly or indirectly; and the use of these means must only be granted to the highest bidder in the surrender of power or the guarantee of its use in the interests of Jewry. In the past the control of money, gold, and credit, has been the primary weapon of the Zionists.

"But the money myth has been exploded; and legal control of raw materials is essential to the pursuit of the policy to a final and successful issue . . ."

Much of the vital evidence of the operation of a long-term Zionist policy is contained in *The Brief for the Prosecution*, from which the above passage is quoted; and as we cannot recapitulate it here, since this essay is designed only to bring the real gravity of the present crisis into perspective, we must beg our readers, virtually as a matter of life and death, to read that work.

But in the light of a long-term Zionist policy, it is possible to understand the situation in the Middle East.

It is evident in retrospect that, whatever its future status is supposed to be, the present function of the State of Israel in total Zionist strategy is that of *agent provocateur* in the Middle East. The Jewish General Staff at present has its Headquarters in New York; and the Israelis are an army deployed for a purpose. It would be absurd to suppose that the Jewish Higher Command has any different regard for its troops than had say the German Higher Command, so long as their sacrifice furthered the general policy.

The immediate objective is to deprive Great Britain of oil—i.e., of her last remaining vestige of independence. And to that end Russia and the U.S.A.—*in both of which countries International Finance, and hence the Zionists, have a controlling interest*—are deployed to prevent decisive action by Great Britain until action is no longer possible—because of lack of oil.

It is much too late in the crisis to write a book to 'prove' what is suggested here. If those in a position to take the swift action necessary cannot see now the true nature of the crisis, the crisis will be resolved to our ruin.

The situation, then, appears to be this. The dollar shortage is the outcome of deliberate financial policy. This makes Middle Eastern oil vital to Great Britain and Europe. The offer, the withdrawal of the offer, of 'American' finance for the Aswan dam was deliberate provocation of Nasser to

nationalise the canal. The attack of the Israelis was designed to trigger the explosive situation in the Middle East, with the objective of cutting off the oil supplies.

While the revolt of the Hungarians was undoubtedly genuine, it was probably 'allowed' to occur, since that would provide an excuse for the movement of the Red Army westward. Then, when shortage of oil causes unemployment, disruption of the economy, and finally riots, the Red Army will come to the 'support' of the 'proletariat', and, directed by the Great German General Staff, should have little difficulty in bringing into being the United Soviet States of Europe—dominated, at long last, by Israel.

THE BRIEF FOR THE PROSECUTION

A penetrating examination of the period of uneasy truce between 1918 and 1939, by C. H. Douglas, wherein he lays bare a coherent, conscious, over-riding policy in full operation in every country and traceable to a central origin. This policy is still in operation today.

9/3d. posted

The powers vested in the undersecretary-general of the United Nations may well constitute the ultimate power of life and death over every human being on the face of the earth. There have been eight holders of the office. They have been communists without exception, seven from the USSR. That the United Nations Organisation is world communism under construction is revealed in

THE FEARFUL MASTER

by G. Edward Griffin

8/6d. posted

The Menace of Communism

A brochure containing a comprehensive list of books on the International Communist Conspiracy (**with up-to-date list of addenda**) indicates the answers to the questions, "Why does the West pursue in Africa the policies so vigorously advocated by the U.S.S.R. and Communist China? Is it by accident, incompetence or design?"

Free on request

The Battle for Rhodesia

K.R.P. Publications Ltd. are continuing to stock the South African edition of this book by Douglas Reed, price 20/- posted. The English edition has been published by Anthony Gibbs Library 33 Limited under the title "Insanity Fair '67" with the final chapter brought more up-to-date. The English edition is also available from K.R.P. Publications Ltd., price 26/- posted.

Social Credit in 1967

A Review for New Readers

Available end-July in booklet form
3/- posted. Special rates for quantities

K.R.P. Publications Ltd., 245 Cann Hall Road, London, E.11.

Published by K.R.P. Publications Ltd., at 245 Cann Hall Road, Leytonstone, London E.11.
Printed by E. Fish & Co. Ltd., Liverpool.