

THE SOCIAL CREDITER

FOR POLITICAL AND ECONOMIC REALISM

Vol. 48 No. 6

SATURDAY, 15 JUNE, 1968

1s. 3d. Fortnightly

Lest We Forget

(AN ANALYSIS FROM *The Review of the News**, APRIL 24, 1968)

(Concluded)

Dr. King of course was the inventor of "nonviolence". What actually was "nonviolence"? How did it work? Well, in *Saturday Review* for April 3, 1965, he tells us:

"1. Nonviolent demonstrators go into the streets to exercise their constitutional rights.

"2. Racists resist by unleashing violence against them.

"3. Americans of conscience in the name of decency demand federal intervention and legislation.

"4. The Administration, under mass pressure, initiates measures of immediate intervention and remedial legislation."

Now remember, this isn't my idea. This is straight from King himself. And observe that according to Dr. King himself, the violence that usually occurred in one of his demonstrations wasn't unexpected, wasn't to be avoided, wasn't something to be sorry about. It was exactly what he wanted. It was the point to the whole Production.

It was in fact, said Dr. King, the *only reason* for a "non-violent" demonstration: to generate more pressure on the Congress to install more collectivism.

"For weeks," explains *Newsweek* of March 22, 1965, "Martin Luther King had been escalating his Selma voter-registration campaign toward the state he calls 'creative tension'—the setting for a paroxysm of segregationist violence that can shock the nation to action . . ."

"The Negroes' rationale in holding night marches," explains the *New York Times* of February 24, 1964, "is to provoke the racist element in white communities to show its worst."

So King's "nonviolence", to repeat, not only wasn't in any way an attempt to avoid violence—according to King himself, violence was an inescapable, essential, desirable part of it. "Nonviolence" meant only that King himself did not use the violence—he caused it. He provoked it, finally forcing "racists"—everyone who doesn't own a pair of sandals and doesn't need a bath—either to lie down and die or to retaliate, so that King could play the innocent victim. "Non-violence" in short was nothing else but a demonstration of dialectical materialism, the pseudoscience invented by Marx, according to which Marxists advance by controlling *both sides* of the conflict; by advancing a *thesis*, which provokes an *antithesis*—a reaction by reactionaries—a struggle which produces a *synthesis*, which becomes a new *thesis*, and continues until the complete victory of Socialism.

"In short," said King in *Stride Toward Freedom* (New York, Harper & Row, 1958, pp. 94-95), "I read Marx as I

read all of the influential historical thinkers—from a dialectical point of view, combining a partial yea and a partial no. . . . The Kingdom of God is neither the thesis of individual enterprise nor the antithesis of collective enterprise, but a synthesis which reconciles the truths of both."

So the ironic truth is that King contributed to his own murder. For in Memphis he was once again applying his philosophy of "nonviolence", was he not? Once again, he was trying to provoke violence according to stage 2 of his tactics.

And he succeeded.

And what were the "immediate intervention and remedial legislation" King was after according to stage 4?

In the Selma March, for instance, in 1965, the violence he provoked according to stage 2, followed on schedule by the sympathy of stage 3, caused the lightning passage of the "voting rights" bill, under which the federal government grabbed from the states power to register voters—the point being, of course, that in any dictatorship, whether Communist or Nazi, all the power must be centralized.

And soon King's organization will launch his "Poor People's March" on Washington. The plan as you know envisions the actual interruption of Congress unless "poor people" are handed about \$100 billion—which would be used as usual to recruit, train, finance and defend the Communist gangs which are destroying our country, through the "war on poverty". For such an amount of course you have to put on a good show. You need some really bloody "non-violence".

And where is it all heading? What is the goal? Suppose the "Poor People's March" does manage to interrupt Congress. Suppose in fact that so many "poor people" physically occupy the government, that the government is paralyzed and cannot function. What would we have?

What we would have of course is the Russian Revolution. We would have a coup—the seizure of our government by "nonviolence": by force.

Now imagine once again that you are one of the small band of rich, educated and not at all oppressed conspirators secretly running the communization of America. And once again you are looking down from your skyscraper in New York. Your scheme to create a race war is going very well. You are sorry you had to wait so long, of course—you remember wishing years ago that you could immediately indulge your great love of killing—but you knew that Americans of both colors had to be properly prepared. So you began with something Americans could be sold: "nonviolent integration", and you used a clergyman named King to sell

(continued on page 4)

*Published weekly by Correction, Please!, Inc., 395 Concord Avenue, Belmont, Massachusetts 02178, U.S.A.

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: 01-387 3893

IN AUSTRALIA—

Business: Box 2318V, G.P.O., Melbourne, Victoria 3001

Editorial: Box 3266, G.P.O., Sydney, N.S.W. 2001

(Editorial Head Office).

THE SOCIAL CREDIT SECRETARIAT

Personnel—Chairman: Dr. B. W. Monahan, 4 Torres Street, Red Hill, Canberra, Australia 2600. Deputy Chairman: British Isles: Dr. Basil L. Steele, Penrhyn Lodge, Gloucester Gate, London, N.W.1. Telephone: 01-387 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. 2001

FROM WEEK TO WEEK

Gallup Polls, and above all the results of the British municipal elections, establish beyond doubt that the 'British' Socialist Government is now the most unrepresentative and unpopular government of modern times. No doubt the hidden influences which stage-managed its election anticipated this development, for they carefully destroyed the Conservative leadership in advance. The precipitous rise to popularity of Mr. Enoch Powell indicates that it was not specifically the immigration issue which caused this rise—because the immigration issue as such is a great problem only in some areas—but that the British recognised someone who spoke for them and their own country; for the British for centuries have been nurtured in the idea that the Englishman's home is his castle. Socialism's fundamental idea of course is government "right of entry"—not only into homes, but into the personal affairs of individuals; the card-indexing and computerising of the population.

The British, no doubt, with a Cabinet of Powells, would respond as they did at the crisis of Dunkirk. The mass media are doing their worst—to make sure the opportunity is not presented to them. But if it is not yet too late for public opinion to root out the traitorous Socialists and establish a patriotic Government, it is essential to recognise the truth and force of Douglas's observation that *no real solution of our problems is possible which does not traverse the canons of orthodox finance. Any administration which succeeded the Wilson cabal with the idea that better 'management' of the economy would rectify the economic problems which are the root cause of the political problems of crime and protest would rapidly become discredited, and should this happen to a patriotic Government, the gates would be thrown wide open to the Communist reign of terror. It is precisely large-scale 'management' which compounds the problems which it is supposed to resolve—the history of every one of the nationalised industries and services is sufficient proof of that.*

Douglas once, when asked what should be the first thing any country proposing to alter its financial system should do,

replied "Arm to the teeth". Well, of course, Britain's teeth have been extracted. But in the condition of the world today it is just possible that *moral* armament might suffice—that is to say, a united nation supporting a patriotic Government prepared to expose and defy the powers of financial internationalism. It is not certain that at this juncture the U.S.A., which represents the *official* Headquarters of International Finance, would resort to armed force, whereas a further collapse of the economic system *is* certain to lead to Communism. If there is a way back from that impasse it lies in making suitable barter (in principle) arrangements with other countries for the supply of *necessary* raw materials, and the use of internal credit to subsidise home consumption and to restore incentive by the progressive reduction of taxation.

Every country except those already subjugated, but apparently Britain in particular, is under attack by International Finance-Communism; and Britain has been driven to the point where counter-attack is not so much the best means of defence, as the only one.

Patriotism is defined as defence of or being zealous for one's country's freedom or rights; but its full meaning has its roots in human—even animal—nature. It is instinctive as, for example, sexual impulse is instinctive. Closely related is the concept of patrimony—property *inherited* from one's ancestors. Patriotism is *family* writ large; patrimony is an external inheritance as real as the individual's internal genetic inheritance. But patrimony includes more than physical property: it includes cultural differentiations—language and even dialect differences, social customs and usages, religions, arts, skills, monuments and specific histories. In this field like attracts like, so that immigrants from one country to another tend to settle in communities, reproducing, so far as possible, the cultural differentiations of the original homeland.

The internationalist endeavour to abolish patriotism and internationalise the native patrimony is thus equivalent to the endeavour to repress the sexual impulse: in both cases the instinctive drive breaks forth in perverted activities. This is probably the *basis* of the mounting crime and student and other protests—which, senseless and destructive as they appear, and incited and exploited by Communist conspiracy as they are, yet are the only outlet for an inborn will-to-freedom and to property which are being denied by the mounting repression of government and technology.*

The internationalist endeavour to extirpate patriotism and abolish private property has been proved to be a Conspiracy, most readily recognised now in its manifestation as International Communism. But it is probably just because it goes against the grain of fundamental human nature (whatever its attraction; to perverted seekers after power) that Douglas said that the Conspiracy had no hope of ultimate success, although it had a high chance of setting back civilisation by hundreds of years. Already it has accomplished the death or slavery of millions, and the brain-washing of millions more. Since Douglas wrote, the technological means to increase the power of central governments have expanded almost geometrically so that the advance towards Orwell's '1984' is visible; and beyond that to Huxley's *Braze New World* only less so.

For a close analysis of this situation, see *Like A Conquered Province—The Moral Ambiguity of America: The Massey Lectures for 1966 (C.B.C.)* by Dr. Paul Goodman. Random House: New York, 1967. Available from K.R.P. Publications Ltd., at 43/- posted.

In this context, it is worth recalling what Douglas wrote in 1924 in *Social Credit* (Part III, Chapter III): ". . . the break-up of the present financial and social system is certain . . . the only point at issue is the length of time which the break-up will take, and the tribulations we have to undergo while the break-up is in progress . . . There will probably come well within the lives of the present generation, a period at which the blind forces of destruction will appear to be in the ascendant . . ."

"There is, at the moment, no party, group or individual possessing at once the power, the knowledge, and the will, which would transmute the growing social unrest and resentment (now chiefly marshalled under the crudities of Socialism and Communism) into a constructive effort for the regeneration of Society. This being the case, we are merely witnesses to a succession of rear-guard actions on the part of the so-called Conservative elements in Society, elements which themselves seem incapable, or undesirous of genuine initiative; a process which can only result, like all rear-guard actions, in a successive, if not successful, retreat on the part of the forces attacked. While this process is alone active, there seems to be no sound ground for optimism; but it is difficult to believe that the whole world is so bereft of sanity that a pause for reflection is too much to hope for, pending a final resignation to utter catastrophe."

Few people would have agreed with that forecast in 1924; but making allowance for the emergence of obvious Conspiracy, and the fantastic technological developments of the intervening years, 1968 sees its nigh near fulfilment. The only question now is: have we got a pause for reflection, or are we consigned to utter catastrophe?

It is possible that we have a pause. If we have, we have an opportunity. To take advantage of that opportunity requires definite exertion and expert navigation by that minority which recognises the true nature and profound gravity of the situation, if we are to survive the cataract which must now be run (*op. cit.*).

Counter-revolution?

The following letter is from *The Daily Telegraph*, April 26, 1968:

Sir — Whatever may be thought or said about the phrasing or presentation of Mr. Powell's Birmingham speech, no one can deny its impact or the support it has received in many quarters.

To my mind its significance may lie not simply in the immigration question but in the shock Mr. Powell has administered to those "progressives" who have for too long set the fashion in British politics and public thought; who have even succeeded in cowing the British people into a mood of apprehensive and unaccustomed submission by using a near-monopoly of the communications media in order to identify their particular views with a generalised and bogus morality.

At last a senior and respected politician has said what others fear to say. He said it about immigration. He could have said it about other things.

Perhaps the British people do not accept or believe their country to be small, weak and morally bound to accept the strictures and instructions of the United Nations or indeed of any other international grouping which shouts loud enough. Perhaps they really are fed up with the farce over

Rhodesia and South Africa and with the apparently endless retreats and obeisances of their leaders.

Perhaps they really are tired of seeing their public places invaded and their tolerance exploited by gangs of so-called students bent solely on mischief and violence. Perhaps they have just about had enough of "progressive" government and permissive society.

The threat to the British nation is more subtle and more pervasive than the difficulties caused by immigration alone. Many ordinary people know this, but someone had to articulate. If this is the powder keg into which Mr. Powell has thrown his match he may in the end be seen to have done his country signal service.

Yours faithfully,

STEPHEN HASTINGS.

House of Commons.

Trouble for Canada

Canadian Intelligence gives the following summary of the background of Pierre Elliot-Trudeau, the new leader of the Canadian Liberal Party and Prime Minister:

1940: "Booted out of the Canadian Officer Training Corps (COTC) during the War for lack of discipline." (Robert McKenzie, in *Toronto Star*, March 3, 1968)

1941: Associated with anti-War and Red-supported Bloc Populaire in undermining war effort.

1945: Enrolled at Harvard, spawning ground of leftist intellectuals.

1947. Attended London School of Economics. Told Norman DePoe that Prof. Harold Laski, the Marxist, was "the most stimulating and powerful influence he has encountered". (*Weekend Magazine* No. 13, 1966)

1950: Was in Shanghai when the Communists took over, and became a rabid admirer of Mao Tse-tung and his Red régime.

1951: Back in Montreal, he launched the leftist publication *Cité Libre*. Among the well-known Reds who collaborated, we note: Prof. Raymond Boyer (convicted of Soviet espionage in the Gouzenko Case); Stanley B. Ryerson, leading theoretician of the Communist Party and editor of *Marxist Review*; Pierre Gelinas, Quebec director of Agitation & Propaganda ("Agitprop") of the Communist Party.

1952: Led delegation of Communists to the Moscow Economic Conference.

1953: Barred entry into the United States as an "inadmissible" person.

1955: Launched Le Resselement, a leftist "united front" rally in Quebec, but the CCF refused to join because it was too leftist.

1960: Led a Communist delegation to Peking for Red victory celebration.

1961: *Social Purpose for Canada*, the socialist handbook written by Marxist and NDP leaders, was published, containing a chapter by Mr. Trudeau in which he lauds Mao Tse-tung, urges socialists not to "water down" their socialism but to make its approach more "flexible", and to welcome federalism "as a valuable tool which permits dynamic parties to plant socialist governments in certain provinces, from which the seed of radicalism can slowly spread".

1962: Amidst protests, this millionaire leftist succeeded in gaining appointment as a professor at University of Montreal, which became a pro-Castro stronghold. Appointed to executive of Red-line Canadian Peace Research Institute.

1963: Campaigned with NDP against Liberals, whom he called "idiots" because they had decided to accept nuclear defence weapons.

1965: Having decided to use the Liberal Party as an instrument to propel himself to political power, he and leftists Jean Marchand and Gérard Pelletier became 'Liberals' and were elected to Parliament, where they formed the "New Guard" of the Liberal Party.

1966: Appointed Parliamentary Secretary to P.M. Pearson.

1967: Named Minister of Justice. Credited in Communist press with intervening personally to reinstate hippie rag *Georgia Straight*, which had been banned by Vancouver Mayor Campbell for obscenity.

Introduced bill to legalise abortion and homosexuality, spearheading drive to shift Canadian justice from Scriptural to Humanistic basis.

1968: Moving, behind fantastic Press-TV build-up, towards leadership of Liberal Party and Prime Ministry of Canada."

Lest We Forget

(continued from page 1)

it—to capitalize on the fact that black Americans have sometimes been the victims of injustice—and to sell it so as deliberately to create the bitterness you need.

But now it's 1968, and your scheme is going very well. There's lots of beautiful killing and blood. "Watts was glorious," you said, if you happen to be Herbert Aptheker. Now you no longer need to bother with such nonsense as "integration". Yet at the same time, you have serious problems. Your use of King is being more and more exposed. His use of violence is becoming understood. Everybody says he is becoming unpopular. In fact, he is turning from an asset into a liability. "Reactionaries" are preventing the passage of important Communist legislation. King is doing his best, but you are having difficulty, for instance, getting that \$100 billion.

Suppose King were violently removed? you ask yourself. You no longer need him—so suppose he were brutally murdered as part of his next demonstration of dialectical materialism. That would be the ultimate in "nonviolence". With one 30.06 bullet you could blame "white racism", as usual, restore King's reputation, further accustom Americans to martial law, pass your Communist legislation—and at the same time notify your troops around the country that "nonviolence" is dead, too, and should be replaced by guerilla warfare.

So you call in your shooters and you order the hit.

Observe the first results of the murder. Riots and looting raged for a week, making Americans of both races furious. Many feel great sympathy for the victim. And in New York, Nelson Rockefeller was able to ram through a \$6 billion "urban renewal" program which lets the state intervene over the heads of the mayors.

Rockefeller participated by the way in a memorial march for King, arm linked with Charles Kenyatta, head of Harlem's Mau Mau Society—named for the Communist terrorists of Kenya. Whether or not Kenyatta is just another psycho, I don't know, but he specializes in appearing in public with a machete on which a Bible has been impaled.

In fact that's what he was carrying when Rockefeller took his arm.

And in Washington, Johnson's Communist housing bill was passed. When the Communists grabbed Russia, they

naturally also grabbed housing, using the welfare of workers as the excuse. They didn't say they were doing it for black people, because no black people are there. They said that everyone had the "right" to a certain living space, and moved those who had less in with those who had more. Remember that no black people were involved—everybody who was, was as white as the Governor of Mississippi—so those who resisted weren't racists, were they? They resisted because the point as always was not to establish "racial justice", but to control the population. And Party members and sympathizers naturally got the best.

The same thing will now begin to happen here.

This is why we must continue telling the truth about Martin Luther King; not for revenge, or just to destroy a phony reputation, but because of the use to which his murder—like that of John F. Kennedy—is being put.

So who killed King?

The fact that Ramsey Clark heads the investigation is suspicious enough. Anybody who believes Clark has any interest in truth should be sent immediately to me. I'm trying to sell the Brooklyn Bridge. And observe that his investigation already smells like last week's mackerel.

If and when Clark ever presents a suspect, you can bet we will be told that he is a "right-wing extremist".

So what should Americans do now?

(1) Demand that we be told all the facts and that the investigation continue until King's killers are found. Then we might as well also find out who killed Medgar Evers, blew up the four little black girls in that church in Birmingham in 1963, and helped Communist Oswald kill Kennedy.

(2) Refuse to be intimidated. King was almost entirely a creation of public relations—of a bunch of crooked reporters, most of them white. Like the barrage of publicity after the Kennedy assassination, the current propaganda is designed not only to advance Communism but to demoralize the opposition—to make Americans uncertain and guilty. In fact, on Long Island, for instance, hoodlums stoned automobiles whose drivers refused to turn on their headlights "for the King". Needless to say, the growing number of Americans of both colors aware of what King really was, and really was doing, will not be given coverage on CBS. You are not as alone as that lie net would have you think.

(3) Continue exactly as we have been—telling the truth—explaining that "free handouts" are nothing but the bait of dictators; that the trouble in this country isn't caused by black people, but by the small band of criminals—most of them white—who have been framing them; and that the "civil rights movement", which now has taken the life of Martin Luther King, was designed from the beginning to enslave us all.

—ALAN STANG

Further supplies of this issue and that of 1st June are available at a nominal charge of 4d. per copy posted, but additional contributions towards costs would be appreciated.

Fabian Freeway

High Road to Socialism in the U.S.A.

by Rose L. Martin, 57/6 posted

A most detailed and carefully documented account of the origin, growth and present dimensions of the Fabian Socialist conspiracy, with its now virtually total control of the government administrations of both Britain and the U.S.A.

Printed by E Fish & Co Ltd Liverpool